

of alcoholic beverages for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of various citizens of Tacoma, Wash., and resolutions of Tacoma Central Labor Council, Tacoma, Wash., opposing universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, relating to the fixing of the price of cereals by the Congress of the United States, asking that prices for cereals other than wheat should be made and based upon the present established price of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Fifteenth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, Spanish-American War Veterans, in convention assembled, pledging allegiance to our country and tendering their services, condemning any influence tending to weaken our cause, and asking that no compromise peace be made; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Keystone Division No. 16, Sons of Temperance, of Pennsylvania, favoring prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, favoring free zones in the ports of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution by the Boot and Shoe Travelers' Association of New York, protesting against the zone system and demanding its repeal; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Department of Rhode Island, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring passage of the Smoot pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 20, 1918.

The House was called to order by Mr. KITCHIN, Speaker pro tempore at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Great Spirit, in whose all-encircling love we dwell, which reflects itself in splendor from all the works of Thy hands, and which poured itself out in humble submission, in a sublime sacrifice, on the Hill of Calvary, we thank Thee that we were born and reared under the divine influences of the Christian religion; that we are citizens of the United States of America; both of which are calculated to bring out all that is purest, noblest, best, in man. The world is facing a great crisis. We are involved in it, and we most earnestly pray that we may reflect our loyalty to Thee and to the principles embodied in the Constitution of the United States, in a patriotism sublime in its sacrifices; that righteousness, liberty, truth, justice, may live, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for the payment of annual installments on the purchase price for land in the Standing Rock Indian Reservations.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JONES, OF VIRGINIA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House a communication, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

SAN JUAN, P. R., April 19.
SPEAKER HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.:

Porto Rico House takes part in mourning of Congress and Nation for death of illustrious Representative WILLIAM A. JONES, who devoted such noble thoughts and continuous labor to this country, where his memory will be always kept with gratitude.

JOS. E. DE DIEGO, Speaker.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE SULLOWAY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

MR. WASON rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Hampshire rise?

MR. WASON. For the purpose of offering a resolution setting aside Sunday, April 28, for memorial exercises in honor of the late Representative SULLOWAY, of New Hampshire. I move the adoption of the following order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Sunday, the 28th day of April, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. CYRUS ADAMS SULLOWAY, late a Representative from the State of New Hampshire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

MR. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE CHARACTER OF A STATEMENT CONTAINED IN A LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC INFORMATION AND TRANSMITTED TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN A REPORT MADE BY THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

MR. CARAWAY, from the special committee appointed by the Speaker on the 11th day of April, 1918, in response to a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives to inquire into certain remarks alleged to have been included in a letter addressed to the Postmaster General by the chairman of the Committee on Public Information and by the Postmaster General transmitted to the House of Representatives on April 10, 1918, which language so complained of is as follows: "When Mr. Treadway stated in the House that he was 'reliably informed that there has been a very large amount of that class of mail matter sent over, and it is a well-known fact that great quantities of that class of matter have been placed in their hands overseas,' he made assertions the absolute baselessness of which could have been ascertained by a telephone inquiry," begs leave to make the following report:

After a careful search of the precedents, the committee finds that the House of Representatives has uniformly refused to receive and make a part of its records communications reflecting upon the House as a whole or any Member thereof.

December 14, 1842, the Speaker laid before the House a communication from S. Pleasanton, Fifth Auditor of the Treasury Department, which was as follows:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
"FIFTH AUDITOR'S OFFICE,
"December 14, 1842.

"SIR: In a report of a debate in the House of Representatives on Monday last, contained in the National Intelligencer of yesterday, it is stated that Mr. Sprigg, among other things, observed: 'He remembered, too, that the House at this instance had made a call upon the department (Treasury) for full and detailed information as to the whole system of managing the lighthouses of the United States, the contracts for buildings, for supplying oil, paying inspectors, etc., but no answer had ever been obtained, notwithstanding the clerks which the House had voted them and notwithstanding numerous and repeated promises made to him personally.'

"It was with extreme surprise I read this statement, as I had a perfect recollection that it was wholly erroneous; and as it is calculated, uncorrected, to injure the Treasury Department unjustly in the public estimation, I hope you and the House will excuse me for setting the Member right.

"It is sufficient to state that the whole of the information called for by the House in relation to lighthouses on Mr. Sprigg's motion was transmitted, as required by the resolution, partly to the Committee on Commerce on the 8th of March last and is contained in their printed report, No. 811, and partly to the House of Representatives direct by the Secretary of the Treasury on the 11th of March last, and by the House ordered to be printed, and will be found in Document No. 140 of the last session. These two documents contain all the information which was called for by the House.

"Mr. Sprigg individually called for the sessions of jurisdiction by the States over all the lighthouse sites, from the adoption of the Constitution; and, although so much labor and time as it required might have been declined on his individual call, yet, as I was desirous of furnishing all the information in my power to every person who sought it, the information was prepared and furnished as far as it was to be found in the office.

"I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
"S. PLEASANTON.

"Hon. JOHN WHITE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

The communication was by the House, after full consideration, adjudged objectionable and a resolution adopted as follows:

"Resolved, That the communication addressed to the Speaker of this House by S. Pleasanton on the 14th instant in relation to some remarks made in the House before that time by Mr. Sprigg, a Member from Kentucky, which paper was received by the Speaker and laid before the House without knowledge of its contents, was not such a communication as ought to have been received and presented to the House; that the same be withheld from the Journal and files of the House and the original be returned to the writer." (See Congressional Globe, 3d sess. 27th Cong., p. 101.)

In 1848 Mr. Medill, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, addressed the following communication to the House of Representatives:

"To the honorable the House of Representatives of the United States:

"During the debate which took place in the House of Representatives on an amendment made by the Senate to the civil and diplomatic bill allowing to David Taylor the sum of \$12,800 for a certain reservation claimed by him under the treaties of 1817 and 1835 with the Cherokees, as reported in the National Intelligencer of this morning, I find the following, viz:

"Mr. Clingman supported the claim and took occasion to warn the committee against any opposition which might have been made to it by Mr. Medill, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who, he understood, had endeavored to prejudice the claim because the agents of the claimant peremptorily refused to make an allowance for his favoring the claim. Mr. C. denounced the Indian Bureau as thoroughly corrupt. He had been credibly informed that the books in that bureau had been altered and falsified for corrupt purposes (though this, he believed, had been done during the incumbency of Mr. Crawford, the predecessor of the present commissioner). He had no confidence in Mr. Medill, nor would he believe any statement he should make. An application had been made to the department to have the books taken out of his office and deposited in some place where they would be safe from alterations."

"It is seldom that a public officer is justified in noticing attacks of this kind, but the above charges are of so grave and specific a character and so seriously reflect not only upon myself, personally and officially, but upon the administration of the whole of that branch of the public service intrusted to my charge that a different course on this occasion seems to be called for."

The House on the same day it was read adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the communication of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs be returned to that officer, and that he be informed that this House considers the language thereof as offensive and indecorous."

This appears in a report of the second session of the Thirtieth Congress, date August 12, 1848, page 1070 of the Congressional Globe.

On the 3d day of February, 1865, the Senate adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary of the Navy for certain information. In answer to the resolution the Secretary of the Navy transmitted a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy in which the Assistant Secretary undertook to reply to a speech that had before that time been made by Senator Hale on the floor of the Senate. This communication from the Secretary of the Navy was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate for its consideration. On March 4, 1865, the committee reported as follows:

"The only information that the Secretary was instructed to give was in relation to the particular matters mentioned in the resolution. What may have been said by Senators, while it was under consideration, was not submitted to him either for approval or censure, nor was he called upon or authorized to vindicate himself or any person in his department from allegations made or supposed to have been made in the Senate. However, the person supposing himself assailed is not without redress; he may appeal to the public judgment through the press or request the Senate to constitute a committee of inquiry as to the truth of the charges; but there exists no right in an officer of the Government, in answer to specific inquiries, to comment on the debates of the body nor to vindicate his conduct, either individually or officially, in any matters not called for in the inquiries of the Senate. If differences exist between any member of the Senate and a citizen not a member, it is not the proper province of the body to settle them. Their duties are limited to matters proper for legislation or to such as refer to the public good and require investigation."

"With these views it is the opinion of your committee that the letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, as accompanying the communication of the Secretary, should not have been sent to the Senate by the latter officer:

"1. Because the first part of it does not profess to relate to the Senate resolution but to be in response to the allegations of Hon. John P. Hale against the writer.

"2. Because the remainder of it merely gives a history of his conduct in attempting to relieve the garrison of Fort Sumter in 1861, an attempt worthy of praise, but which has not the most remote connection with a single inquiry embraced by the resolution."

"The committee therefore recommend the adoption of this resolution:

Resolved, That the letter to the Secretary of the Navy from the Assistant Secretary should not have been communicated in answer to the Senate resolution of February 3, 1865, and that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to return the same to the Secretary of the Navy."

The resolution was adopted and the communication returned to the Secretary of the Navy.

These proceedings are reported in the second session of the Thirty-eighth Congress on page 1365 of the Congressional Globe.

The House likewise refused to receive a message of Mr. Roosevelt, then President of the United States, in which there were statements calculated to reflect upon Members of Congress, and adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House in the exercise of its constitutional prerogatives declines to consider any communication from any source which is not in its own judgment respectful; and be it further

Resolved, That the special committee and the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from any consideration of so much of the President's annual message as relates to the Secret Service and is above set forth, and that the said portion of the message be laid on the table."

The language contained in the communication to the Postmaster General and attributed to the chairman of the Committee on Public Information is, in the opinion of the committee, impertinent and not respectful. In the language of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary in the Hale case, "there exists no right in an employee of the Government in answer to specific inquiries to comment on the debates of the body nor to vindicate his conduct, either individually or officially, in any matters not called for in the inquiries."

With these views it is the opinion of this committee that the letter of the chairman of the Committee on Public Information should not be received by the House. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to respectfully return the communication containing the same to the Postmaster General.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report is unanimous and full, and the members of the committee are desirous this morning not to interfere with the present consideration of the naval appropriation bill, unless some member of the special committee wants to be heard, I want to move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas moves the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I notice a slight typographical error in the reading by the Clerk of a citation, and inasmuch as the Members may want to look at this some time, I want to call the attention of the Clerk to it. The Congressional Globe citation was given as on page 1070. That citation, as I recall distinctly, is page 1170. I have just sent for the Globe to verify that, but I am certain that is correct.

Mr. CARAWAY. If it is an error, it can be corrected. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that if it turns out to be an error it may be corrected by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARAWAY. I move the previous question on the adoption of the report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the report.

The question was taken, and the report was unanimously adopted.

SABOTAGE.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House last Monday on the so-called sabotage bill reference was made to a letter from the Attorney General of the United States. This letter sought, among other things, to justify the Department of Justice upon its conduct in handling cases of sabotage, sedition, and other acts of disloyalty. The letter was quite lengthy, and was given by the Department of Justice to the press, and at my request was also inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Attorney General contended mainly that the fault did not lie with the Department of Justice, but rather that it was handicapped by reason of needed legislation. I have a letter from the American Defense Society, which has among its officers and upon its board of trustees some of the most prominent people in the country and has as its honorary president a former President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt; and in this letter a pointed criticism is made of some statements of the Attorney General, and several of them are challenged. The subject matter is of such vast interest and importance to the American people that the country should know what this letter contains. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks so that that letter may be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

AMERICAN DEFENSE SOCIETY, INC.,
New York, April 17, 1918.

HON. GILBERT A. CURRIE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The public press contains to-day what purports to be the full text of a letter to yourself from the Attorney General of the United States, in answer to a letter of yours to the Department of Justice under date of the 2d instant. The Attorney General's letter, treated at large, appears to be a defense of the procedure during war of the Department of Justice in the performance of its duties and a plea for further legislation. You will, of course, not misunderstand this letter as opposing in any wise any legislation aimed at the suppression of treason, sedition, insurrection, or disloyalty in any form. On the contrary, this society has unqualifiedly taken the position that whatever legislation may be necessary to strengthen the hands of the Government in relation to all such matters should be passed with the utmost promptness. The particular statutes which may be proposed to Congress for its consideration and action must, of course, be scrutinized, lest through the language employed and the detailed recital of particular acts (which is always an error in all criminal legislation) they should be capable of some other application than their intended loyal purpose; lest they be made a vehicle of partisanship; lest they be returned from the defense of the land to the defense of some Governmental underling; lest they be utilized to suppress the pitiless publicity intended in the phrase denominating eternal vigilance to be the price of liberty.

The object of this letter is to call to your attention and freely and openly to criticize certain of the expressions contained in the letter referred to; and since full publicity has been given to that letter, it is requested that equal publicity be given hereto. The letter says that if a strong feeling exists throughout the country that the Government authorities (meaning the Department of Justice) are dealing too leniently with spies and dangerous enemies within the United States, that feeling is mainly caused by the lack of Federal statutes. This is error. The general public feeling which the letter recognizes as existing has been caused in part by the action which has been taken and in part by lack of action by the Department of Justice. The letter is also in error in saying that the Department of Justice has vigorously prosecuted every case of enemy activity of which it has acquired information, for the phrase vigorously prosecuted implies an attempt to enforce the full vigor of existing law, and, so far as known, there have been no prosecutions under the constitutional provision and the Federal statute defining treason, except in the cases of the prosecution of the editors of a German newspaper for editorial articles and an apparently unwarranted prosecution here in New York, both of which cases failed through the court declining to send them to the jury on the ground that the proofs were not sufficient to constitute the crime charged.

Action intended to impede and pro tanto prevent the raising of armies to defend the land are acts of treason if done by one who, for any reason whatsoever, desires that the enemy should prevail, and the question whether such desire be or be not present on the part of the given individual is a question for the jury. So, also, acts done with the intent to diminish the warlike resources of the land—blowing up munition factories, destroying vessels or food supplies—though in such

cases the intent with which the act was done and the desire that the enemy should prevail practically demonstrate themselves by the mere commission of the act. The department has not prosecuted for treason, though the whole world (rightly or wrongly) estimates that treason has been committed here abundantly. Continuing, the letter says: "The stories that dangerous spies have been paroled by this department from internment camps are unqualifiedly false in every particular." This is not ingenuous. So far as known no responsible statement to that effect has been made. Statement, however, has been made that dangerous alien enemies have been paroled from internment camps, and this is not denied.

It will be noted that in that paragraph of the letter there is a "juggling" of the two phrases. First, it is denied that "spies" have been paroled, and the letter then states that "as rapidly as really dangerous alien enemies have come to the attention of Government officers they have been apprehended and interned." The impression created on the mind of the hasty reader is that statements made as to the release from internment of dangerous "alien enemies" have been false, whereas, in fact those statements are really not denied. Under public clamor those powerful "dangerous enemy aliens" who were released have now been reinterned. But that was only brought about by great and publicly expressed criticism and disapproval of the acts of the department in that respect.

The letter also says that "as a matter of policy the action by the department in internment enemy aliens has also been done, so far as possible, without publicity."

If this be true, it is a grave mistake of policy. Internment of a "dangerous" alien enemy (to adopt the Attorney General's erroneous limitation) can have but two objects—to restrain the individual's activities and to deter others—for if internment be only for "dangerous" alien enemies, it falls within the category of punishment, and those are the recognized reasons for all punishment; are, indeed, its only justification. Why, then, should the mistaken policy be pursued of suppressing publicity as to such internments? The mistake is such an one as to raise a doubt of the equipment of the department to perform its functions. It is time that an official statement be made detailing the total number of dangerous enemy aliens who have been interned; the total number of those who have at any time been released; the total number of those who having been released have been reinterned; the total number of those who have been a second time released; and the total number of those who are now in the internment camps.

Similar criticisms apply to the succeeding phrase of the letter: "It is stated that on the night of the declaration of war all the German agents then known to it (the department) were immediately transferred to war prison camps—the number of enemies for obvious reasons being kept secret."

The only obvious reason for such suppression would be that so few German agents were known to the department that it would be an encouragement to the others to continue if the facts were made public.

Later in the letter it is said that the department has "carried out successfully a registration of all male German alien enemies." Without undertaking to vouch for the number, your attention is called to the fact that it has been repeatedly openly stated by the public press that in the city of New York from 20,000 to 32,000 male German alien enemies remain to-day unregistered.

The letter also contains the following phrase "there is as yet no Federal statute except the treason statute (which is unworkable for this purpose) under which the Government can prosecute men who attempt to destroy factories, munitions, and other stores necessary for our armies." No reason is given to sustain the proposition that the treason statute is unworkable for the purpose of punishing those who attempt to destroy factories, munitions, and stores necessary for the Army, and the bald statement in this respect is not correct. The treason statute applies, and since the punishment provided by the treason statute is left to the discretion of the court, to be placed at from 10 years imprisonment and \$10,000 fine up to death, there is every reason why the treason statute should be enforced. There would appear to be a fear lest a jury having convicted, the court would in some case or cases assess the penalty at death. If so, it represents a curious frame of mind where the officers of the law fail to recognize that the destruction of munition factories will cause the loss of the lives of loyal American citizens on the battle field, or if they do recognize this fact hesitate to attempt to prevent such destruction by the condemning of some few "traitors" to death. The human weakness, that what is unseen or not right at hand can not be visualized, would seem to be here apparent. The indirect effect—the death of loyal American soldiers on the battle field—does not impress the mind sufficiently to prevent its shrinking in horror from the idea of inflicting the death penalty on the person who has treacherously caused the deaths of the soldiers. As has been recently said in the public prints, "It is impossible to say that John Smith was killed in France because of some particular act in the United States, yet nevertheless the harvest of sedition is reaped on the battle field." The treason statute applies to all these cases. As to the demand for further legislation, it will be noted that so far as treasonable facts are recited therein, the effect of such legislation is that on the passage of statutes which recite treasonable acts and then award for them penalties excluding any possibility of the application of the death penalty, individuals committing treason will be prosecuted not under the treason statute but under the statute reciting the particular offense. If convicted they will be condemned to terms of imprisonment and after peace is declared these murderers may at least reasonably hope to be released. The letter near its close states that "the Federal Government is impotent to suppress industrial treason." That statement should be immediately refuted. It is quite incorrect. That it should be publicly proclaimed is not to be commended if it were correct. Appearing on the authority of its source it calls for a clear statement of its not only being incorrect but also of how it comes to appear. A virile department does not need the reinforcement of statutes reciting specific acts as constituting crimes, where such acts fall within the definition of an already existing general class. These would appear to be the reasons for the appearance of that unwarranted statement.

The complaint of the United States of America against the Department of Justice is that it seems to be inherently weak.

Yours, respectfully,

AMERICAN DEFENSE SOCIETY,
By CHAS. STEWART DAVISON,
Member, Board of Trustees.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. SUMNERS, be excused indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the pending naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing, at the request of the petitioners, a petition relating to second-class mail matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a petition concerning second-class mail matter. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLET. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10854, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10854, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10854, making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, before that is done I want to offer an amendment following line 17 on page 38. It is a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 38, after line 17, insert:

"(a) That the word 'person' as used in paragraphs (b), (c), next hereafter shall include any individual, trustee, firm, association, company, or corporation. The word 'ship' shall include any boat, vessel, submarine, or any form of aircraft, and the parts thereof. The words 'war material' shall include arms, armament, ammunition, stores, supplies, and equipment for ships and airplanes, and everything required for or in connection with the production thereof. The word 'factory' shall include any factory, workshop, engine works, building used for manufacture, assembling, construction, or any process, and any shipyard or dock yard. The words 'United States' shall include the Canal Zone and all territory and waters, continental and insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(b) The President is hereby authorized and empowered, within the limits of the amounts appropriated therefor:

"First. To place an order with any person for such ships or war material as the necessities of the Government, to be determined by the President, may require and which are of the nature, kind, and quantity usually produced or capable of being produced by such person. Compliance with all such orders shall be obligatory on any person to whom such order is given, and such order shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such person. If any person owning, leasing, or operating any factory equipped for the building or production of ships or war material for the Navy shall refuse or fail to give to the United States such preference in the execution of such an order, or shall refuse to build, supply, furnish, or manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of ships or war material so ordered at such reasonable price as shall be determined by the President, the President may take immediate possession of any factory of such person, or of any part thereof without taking possession of the entire factory, and may use the same at such times and in such manner as he may consider necessary or expedient.

"Second. Within the limit of the amounts appropriated therefor, to modify or cancel any existing contract for the building, production, or purchase of ships or war material; and if any contractor shall refuse or fail to comply with the contract as so modified, the President may take immediate possession of any factory of such contractor, or any part thereof without taking possession of the entire factory, and may use the same at such times and in such manner as he may consider necessary or expedient.

"Third. To require the owner or occupier of any factory in which ships or war material are built or produced to place at the disposal of the United States the whole or any part of the output of such factory, and within the limit of the amounts appropriated therefor, to deliver such output or parts thereof in such quantities and at such times as may be specified in the order at such reasonable price as shall be determined by the President.

"Fourth. To requisition and take over for use or operation by the Government any factory, or any part thereof without taking possession of the entire factory, whether the United States has or has not any contract with the owner or occupier of such factory.

"That all authority granted to the President herein or by him delegated shall cease six months after a final treaty of peace shall be proclaimed between this Government and the German Empire.

"(d) That whenever the United States shall cancel or modify any contract, make use of, assume, occupy, requisition, or take over any factory or part thereof, or any ships or war material, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b), it shall make just compensation therefor, to be determined by the President, and if the amount thereof so determined by the President is unsatisfactory to the person entitled to receive the same, such person shall be paid 50 per cent of the amount so determined by the President and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as added to said 50 per cent shall make up such amount as will be just compensation therefor, in the manner provided for by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves a point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a committee amendment and is identical with what I think is existing law. In the act of March 3, 1917, the naval appropriation bill, this legislation was enacted, but there was this provision, that in time of war or of national emergency arising prior to March 1, 1918, to be determined by the President by proclamation, the President is hereby authorized and empowered, in addition to all other existing provisions of law, to do certain things, which is just the very language used there. Now, there was this amendment that was put on, that all authority granted to the President in this paragraph to be exercised in time of national emergency shall cease on March 1, 1918.

Mr. BUTLER. That is what is known as the Lenroot amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. That is the Lenroot amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Perhaps I may be able to avoid the necessity of asking for a long explanation, if the gentleman will tell me just wherein the change is to be made.

Mr. PADGETT. That will take only a moment. It says here in time of war or national emergency arising prior to March 1, 1918.

Now, that language is changed so it says the President is authorized to do these things. The language is identical. Then this part of it here, that all authority granted to the President in this paragraph to be exercised in time of national emergency shall cease on March 1, 1918, is stricken out, and in lieu of it is inserted that all authority granted herein shall cease within six months after the termination of the war. The other is the identical language.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the only change proposed?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, giving the President authority to take over the Cape May air-station site without having to wait for the purchase of it.

Mr. BUTLER. Is this offered as an amendment to the former amendment, or is it a separate paragraph on a separate subject entirely?

Mr. PADGETT. This is a separate paragraph, following the other. It is an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment to follow the amendment just adopted: "That the act approved October 6, 1917, to provide for the acquisition of an air-station site for the United States Navy at Cape May, N. J., be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"And provided further, That in the event the Secretary of the Navy is unable to satisfactorily consummate the negotiations for the purchase thereof under the provisions of said act approved October 6, 1917, the President is hereby authorized and empowered to take over for and in behalf of the United States the immediate possession of and title to such land, including all easements, rights of way, riparian and other rights appurtenant or appertaining thereto deemed by him to be necessary for the purposes aforesaid, and to make compensation therefor under the terms and provisions of the legislation contained in this act; and the appropriation of \$150,000 appropriated in said act approved October 6, 1917, or so much thereof as may be necessary is hereby made available for the payment of compensation for said property so taken over by the President."

Mr. BUTLER. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. It is a committee amendment and was unanimous. On October 6 last an act was passed authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to purchase certain land at Cape May, N. J., and an appropriation was made of \$150,000 to pay for it under the purchase. The Secretary of the Navy has not been able to negotiate a satisfactory purchase, believing that

the owners are asking more for the land than it is worth. Not being able satisfactorily to arrange a purchase, this is simply to give the President power to take it over for the United States under the same provision that Congress has passed time and again, and as we have just adopted in this bill, and pay for it out of the appropriation that was made for its purchase. That is all the amendment does.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question: Has the chairman any further amendment to offer to this amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. BUTLER. This amendment will stand alone so far as the chairman is concerned?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me see if I am right. This is purely legislation and would be out of order if any one made the point of order. If it should remain in the bill, it might be amended by another amendment out of order, might it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair ordinarily would not cross a bridge until he gets to it, but if there is a proposition in an appropriation bill which is out of order, and it is allowed to remain without the point of order being made against it, any germane amendment to that would be in order, but no affirmative new legislation would be in order upon it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I renew the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, did we not give the President in that bill power to condemn that land?

Mr. PADGETT. No. That was the bill that authorized the purchase and made an appropriation of \$150,000 for its purchase. The owners are asking more for it than it is thought to be worth, and, in order to get a fair price for it, this is simply to authorize the President to take it over in the event they can not arrange a satisfactory purchase. There is no additional money appropriated. It only authorizes the use of the \$150,000 appropriated for its purchase for the payment for it under this condemnation.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I trust no one will object to this amendment. It is my impression that when we gave the right to purchase that land we also gave the right to condemn it in case they would not arrange upon a price. I trust the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will not make the point of order. It is necessary legislation.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment? I think we have a general law which provides for the condemnation of property.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. FOSS. Where they can not come to a reasonable price agreement.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of any such general law. The law generally authorizes the President to take certain things "herein" or "hereby" authorized, or limitations of that kind.

Mr. FOSS. I may be mistaken, but I thought we had a general law upon the subject.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Does the amendment simply proceed to exercise the principle of eminent domain?

Mr. PADGETT. That is all.

Mr. FESS. So that the owner will get what is a reasonable price for his property under the condemnation proceedings?

Mr. PADGETT. It is not a condemnation.

Mr. FESS. It operates in the same way.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. It is simply giving the President power to condemn it under the legislation we have enacted time and again, and pay for it out of the appropriation that was made for its purchase.

Mr. FESS. In the gentleman's opinion, would the Government suffer if this proceeding could not be consummated?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. It was represented at the time as being a very urgent and necessary matter, and the Congress passed it with that idea and for that purpose. It was then understood that we should purchase, but after Congress authorized the purchase of it, the owner wanted to raise the price, and this is simply to authorize the President to take it over and pay for it as we have done in other things, and make available the money that was appropriated for its purchase to pay for it under the condemnation.

Mr. FESS. Then the gentleman's opinion is that when the owner understood that the Government needed it and was ready to buy it he simply put his price up?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I should think we will be justified in this proceeding.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary says that he can not get a reasonable purchase price.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would like to inquire of the chairman whether or not the Government is now occupying this land under lease?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so; that is my recollection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And whether or not we have a good many thousand dollars of investment there?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember the amount, but there was some investment put there. We had that matter up under discussion in October.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. So that it becomes necessary to purchase this at a reasonable figure, or else lose the investment the Government already has?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and the Government needs it. This is simply allowing the Government to take it over under condemnation, because the owners will not offer it at a reasonable price.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. This permits the President to pay to the owners 75 per centum of what is thought to be a reasonable price?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and allows the owner to go into court and sue for whatever he may think is the balance due of the purchase price.

Mr. WALSH. And the \$150,000 which is appropriated, as carried in the amendment, of course, does not limit the total price of the property to that sum?

Mr. PADGETT. It does not, and Congress has no authority to limit it; it could not limit it.

Mr. WALSH. What I mean is the gentleman does not mean to contend that, because the people who own the property want more than the Government is willing to pay, if this amendment is adopted, the amount which the owners will eventually get will not be in excess of the sum carried in the amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Not at all; because the Congress has not the power to do that. The owner has the right to go into court and have his property valued.

Mr. WALSH. Is not this the same property that was stated here in discussion of the amendment or the bill providing for its purchase that it was thought that arrangements had been made for its purchase at a price agreed upon?

Mr. PADGETT. It was understood and represented to us that it could be purchased within the \$150,000.

Mr. WALSH. And the increase in what the owners want, of course, is not due to any fault on the part of the Government?

Mr. PADGETT. None of which I know.

Mr. WALSH. It is simply—

Mr. PADGETT. I think it is one of those cases where they think that the Government needs a thing and has arranged to get it and it is like improving armed live stock by running a maul engine over one of them.

Mr. BROWNING. I will state to the gentleman there were two owners at that time, but since we have made the agreement for \$150,000 it has passed back to the original owner, and it is the original owner now that is holding us up.

Mr. TALBOTT. And he has the idea that the whole \$150,000 was appropriated to buy the land.

Mr. WALSH. He is apparently stricken with the profiteering fever in its most fatal form. I am going to withdraw the point of order, and I hope this matter will be pressed to its speedy conclusion under condemnation proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph after the word "department," line 17, page 38, "hereafter when dismissed from the service every enlisted man in the Navy shall be given an honorable discharge, except in cases where punishment has been inflicted by order of a court-martial."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman going to make a point of order against it? I think this ought to be given consideration.

Mr. PADGETT. For instance, it says that every man shall be given an honorable discharge.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. There are honorable discharges and there are ordinary discharges. A man may not be entitled to an honorable discharge, but might be entitled to an ordinary discharge or a good discharge, or maybe a bad discharge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Or to a discharge as being undesirable.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will reserve the point of order for 15 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I will reserve the point of order for discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the introduction of this amendment, which I concede to be subject to the point of order under the rule, is that recently there has come to my attention action on the part of the Navy Department which is unjustified by one man as against another, and especially unjustified by the Government against one of its citizens, and particularly unjustified by the Government against any man who is enlisted in its service to defend the flag. In the case of a young man named Kennedy, whose mother lives at 58 East Thirty-sixth Place, Chicago, a widow, by the way, whose only support was this son, this boy was discharged from the Navy after having given considerable of his time to the service of his country in trips across the water into the war zone, and his discharge was entitled a discharge of inaptitude. Now, I do not know what they mean by "inaptitude," except that a man may not be able to function in connection with the work he is called upon to discharge. The fact that he is not able to function on account of ill health or for some other reasons ought not, in my judgment, to justify the Navy Department in discharging him from the service and turning him loose upon the streets, as if he had no country. In the case of this particular boy, he was ill and needed medical service, and I appealed to Admiral Benson, who is in command of the Bureau of Navigation—

Mr. PADGETT. Naval Operations.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, Naval Operations; and I asked for his admission to a hospital, at the request of his mother, and I was told that because he was discharged for inaptitude he was not eligible for admission to the hospital. Now, I think that is inhumane on the part of the Government. The boy is still sick, sick almost unto death. He was left to find his way back from the port of discharge as best he knew how.

No one in the Government paid any attention to the fact that he was sick. No one gave any consideration to the fact that he was the son of a widowed mother. No one paid any attention to the fact that he had volunteered to serve his country and that in the service of the country he had lost his health, and because he lost his health the man in command of the ship, who gave no consideration whatever to the boy from a humanitarian side of the case, turned him loose to die, if need be, without friends a thousand miles away from home, and the purpose of the introduction of this amendment to this bill at this time is further to emphasize my objection to the attitude of the commanders of American ships of the Navy toward the men. The time has come when every American should insist that the American boy who offers his life to his country should be treated as an American and not as an outcast. [Applause.]

Mr. VENABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield.

Mr. VENABLE. The gentleman stated this boy was discharged because of inaptitude?

Mr. MADDEN. That is what they said; I do not know.

Mr. VENABLE. Has the gentleman any information or has he sought to get any information as to what this inaptitude is?

Mr. MADDEN. No; except that he was nervous and could not function, which was caused entirely from his sickness, as I learned from his mother, and because a man happens to be sick and could not function—

Mr. VENABLE. Has the gentleman taken—

Mr. MADDEN. Wait a minute until I answer this question. There is no reason why the Government should turn him adrift. He would function if he could. He committed no crime. He is an honest boy. He has a clean record. His moral character is as high as that of any other boy in America. I protest against this kind of treatment toward the boys of America who enlist in the Navy.

Mr. SLAYDEN and Mr. VENABLE rose.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VENABLE. Has the gentleman inquired of the Navy Department as to what they have to say about it?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. That is why I am talking. I can get no satisfaction there. They say he is not eligible to admission to a hospital because the charge against him is inaptitude.

Mr. VENABLE. Does the gentleman say that was all they had to say about it?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. They said he was sick and could not function, and because he was sick and could not function they turned him adrift and did not consider him as worth anything but driftwood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the remarks just made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and was also interested in his statement made yesterday, which will be found on pages 5347 and 5348 of the Record, and the statement in which the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs offered to investigate and look after these cases.

I desire to call the attention of Members to a distressing case of a discharged boy. I ask you to put yourselves in the position of an 18-year-old boy discharged from a ship 4,000 miles away from home, without a cent, without car fare, without proper clothing. The discharge papers given in this case state that he is discharged for undesirability. His letter is dated June, 1917, and soon after that I inquired into his case at the department, have continued to inquire, and am still waiting for information. I read:

PENSACOLA RED CROSS FOR ARMY AND NAVY,
Pensacola, Fla., June 30, 1917.

DEAR MOTHER: I drop you a line to tell you I am in the Navy no longer. I was given an undesirable discharge for some reason, which they will not tell me. They put me on shore without a cent and did not give me car fare. I had been doing as I was told, and was obeying all orders the best I knew how. There were eight of us, and none of us knew why we were being discharged. I will work here to get enough money to take me to New Orleans, and from there I shall ship on a steamer to San Francisco, and will try to work my way to Portland, Oreg., and home.

With lots of love,

GEO. MEDLOCK.

Now, that boy was left as a tramp 4,000 miles away from home, 18 years old, without a car ticket. Let me tell you a little more about it. When I received the letter of protest I sent a letter down to the Personnel Division of the Navy and received a form letter, to which had been added the words that this boy was discharged because he was "undesirable and dirty." That is what gave him the undesirable discharge—dirty.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Then he was not sick?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The statement was that he was discharged because he was "undesirable and dirty." I was ashamed to send that letter to the boy's mother, who has another boy now in Uncle Sam's service. I went down personally to the department, and I am glad to say, for the honor of the department, that they all denied responsibility for that letter. The officer signing it said he did not read it. An investigation of the use of the word "dirty" showed that this boy had been sent all the way down the Pacific coast, through the Panama Canal, and up to Pensacola; that he had developed an extreme case of dysentery, in consequence of which he had lost 40 pounds. He was unable to keep his clothes clean.

I do not want to make any charges against any commander in this time of distress, but such cases must not be. I have a letter here, under date of September 24, from Capt. Senn, Acting Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
Washington, September 24, 1917.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I have received your letter of September 19, 1917, referring further to the discharge as undesirable of George C. Medlock.

In the stress of current work it was not noted that the commanding officer of the — has not made reply to the bureau's inquiry in connection with the discharge of Medlock and certain others. The — has been engaged in very important work, and it may be possible that the commanding officer has had no opportunity to make the full investigation on the report requested by the bureau.

I believe it was stated when you called in person at the bureau that it was evident the commanding officer had erred, and when the bureau learned of all the facts it did the best it could under the circumstances in endeavoring to find Medlock in New Orleans with a view to his enlistment and transfer to the west coast with a view to bringing him near his home. As you may recall, however, Medlock had already left New Orleans.

You ask in your communication if it will be necessary to secure certificates from physicians as to his condition. The bureau sees no good which could result from securing evidence of this kind, as the fact

remains he was discharged, and physicians' statements would do no good unless possibly the parents have in mind a claim for pension, which should, however, be addressed to the Commissioner of Pensions at Washington, D. C.

As soon as the report is received from the commanding officer of the — you will be advised.

Very respectfully,
THOS. J. SENN,
Captain, United States Navy, Acting Chief of Bureau.

They admit a mistake, but the correction is slow in forthcoming. A little later I was asked to take no further steps, and as soon as the bureau was able to communicate with the commanding officer I was promised that I would be informed. I then took no steps until in March of this year, when I called attention to the matter, and I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, to which I have had no reply as yet. I feel justified in calling upon the distinguished chairman of this committee and all the members of the committee to insist on finding out if the United States proposes, at the very time it hangs posters on billboards all over the country appealing to the boys to join the Navy, through the failure of action on the part of its Congress, its House of Representatives and its Senate, to permit officers to set boys ashore, either because they are undesirable or for any other reason for discharge except crime, and leave them as tramps far away from home. It is unjust.

Mr. MADDEN. And especially when they are sick.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; especially when they are sick. This boy when he got home had lost 70 pounds. We found him through the aid of the police of New Orleans and took him home as a sick boy, and he is now anxious to enlist again in the Navy.

Now, I appeal to Members of this House that that can not go on. If an amendment to the law is needed, we should have it, or a special law, perhaps.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. In the case of the boy I referred to, I begged them to admit him to a hospital for treatment, and they said he was not admissible because he had an inaptitude discharge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; and in addition to inhumanity of the act, I submit that it was unfair to the community at Pensacola to turn these boys loose—seven or eight penniless boys—as tramps, and start them possibly on careers as tramps or hoboes or even I. W. W.'s. It is not fair to the community. It is an outrage against patriotic boys who in good faith joined the Navy in order to serve their country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I know nothing whatever of the merits of these matters or the demerits of them. Yesterday, when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] was addressing the House, I tried as earnestly as I could and as politely as I knew how to ascertain from him such information as would enable me to investigate the matter.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, I have no complaint to make about the gentleman from Tennessee. I was not complaining about him, I was complaining about the Navy Department, and it was to them that I was addressing my remarks.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. This morning I went to see Admiral Benson, Chief of Operations, and I called attention to the statement in the Record of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. The admiral said to me that he could not understand why there should be any such treatment or how such a thing as that had happened; that if it had happened it was wrong; and that it would be taken up for investigation, and if the officers had violated their duty they would be called to account.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for one more interruption?

Mr. PADGETT. In just a moment. The law provides that upon discharge a man shall be given a ticket to the place of original enlistment, and they also furnish him a civilian suit of clothes; and the admiral stated that he did not know anything about this, but that he would have it fully and thoroughly investigated, and stated that the letter of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] with the papers had been forwarded for the purpose of getting the facts, and that he would report as soon as he could get them.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say to the gentleman that there have been two sets of letters sent to the department, but only one reply; and if they are so solicitous about doing the right thing, why did they not do it when I called their attention to the facts, instead of waiting for the chairman of the Naval Committee?

Mr. PADGETT. They had already sent the gentleman's letter on for investigation, and stated that they could not show me the papers this morning because they had sent them on to the place to get reports as to the matter.

I knew nothing and heard nothing of the matter mentioned by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] until he mentioned it to me this morning, and I said to him that I would try to do all I could to investigate the matter, and if there was any such practice or any such omission that it should be called to the attention of the department and proper redress made.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to say that they must have known the facts, because they answered the first letter which I wrote, saying that the boy was discharged for inaptitude, so that he could not be admitted to the hospital because of that character of discharge.

Mr. PADGETT. He could not be admitted to the hospital, because a man who is not in the service can not be admitted; and whenever he was discharged from the service he lost that right, whether he had an honorable discharge, a dishonorable discharge, or any other kind of a discharge. He could not be admitted to the hospital after his discharge, because the hospital is for the men in the service. That answers the question about not getting into the hospital.

Mr. MADDEN. That was not the tenor of the answer that they made to me, however.

Mr. PADGETT. That is it, that he was discharged, and therefore could not be admitted to the hospital.

Mr. MADDEN. That he was discharged for inaptitude, and that made him ineligible.

Mr. PADGETT. "Inaptitude" was the cause of his discharge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want it understood that I am making no assault upon the Navy or upon this committee. I do ask for an investigation. I ask that officers who are setting these boys ashore without money be punished. I have waited in the case of Medlock many months—as long as anyone could reasonably expect me to wait—in the hope of action by the Navy Department. The chairman says clothing is given to these boys discharged as undesirable. Well, this Medlock boy seems to have been given one shirt and a pair of overalls and set ashore.

Mr. PADGETT. I know the gentleman stated that, and I want to say—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me get this into the RECORD. This is the statement of the banker who sent the money to New Orleans from Kelso, Wash., for the purpose of finding him and paying his railroad fare on the rest of his long trip to the north Pacific coast. I read:

KELSO STATE BANK,
Kelso, Wash., July 17, 1917.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.:

I have your letter of July 12 in reference to the little Medlock boy. We have apparently located him and are wiring him funds and a ticket to come home from New Orleans. We will get the details from him promptly upon his return. It seems incomprehensible to us here that our Army and naval officers would take young boys like this into the Army or Navy, taking them away from their homes and as far away as Pensacola, Fla., is from Kelso, and then turn them loose on some petty excuse absolutely without even car fare to get to the city. This boy is a good boy here. He writes that he obeyed all orders given him, was doing the best he could, and supposed he was giving complete satisfaction, and without any notice of any kind he and seven others were dumped ashore with a paper stating that they were undesirable and discharged from the Navy, having no money and no clothing, except, I believe, he said in his letter, an old shirt and pair of overalls, and turned loose. This community is very patriotic, and we have sent in the neighborhood of 60 boys to the Army, Navy, and into the marines, and it has been a great consolation to the parents to feel that they would be properly treated by their officers. * * *

Respectfully, yours,

F. L. STEWART.

Mr. Stewart also writes, under date of July 30, 1917, as follows:

Again referring to the matter of the discharge of George Medlock, I am inclosing his discharge herewith, which he desires to have returned to me for him. Medlock tells me that he obeyed all orders and did everything required of him; that he bathed three times a week and went swimming off the ship every day, kept his uniform and equipment in perfect order, and was up until the morning of June 30, so far as he knew, giving perfect satisfaction. At that time an officer picked him out from amongst other boys and ordered him to go to the office, and there were seven other boys picked out and given the same instructions. At one office on the ship they were sent to another, and when they were sent through they were equipped with discharges like the one we are sending to you. The stripes were ripped off their uniforms and they were put ashore without any money, even being told that they could not get their money. Little George himself, for instance, was drawing \$34 per month, receiving same twice a month, and sending part of it back to his parents, who are very poor. He tells us that every two weeks a board was put up where all could see it, showing exactly the amount due each one, and that he could draw it or leave it over to his credit, as he wished. In his case he generally drew his money and sent it home. He figures he has \$17 coming to him, but the discharge shows that he owes the Government \$33.46.

I think I reflect the sentiment of everyone in Kelso in saying that we would like to have the matter looked up. Patriotism is strong here, but the people want justice also. * * *

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know about the facts, but if any wrong has been done it ought to be corrected, and they said they would look into it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In March of this year I made a statement on the floor about this case, which was printed in several western daily newspapers, particularly in California, and I beg to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that that publication brought to me, from writers unknown to me, dozens of letters telling of other similar cases, showing that this practice has been going on. I wrote a personal letter to the Secretary of the Navy in March, to which there has been no reply, but I am sure one will be forthcoming. I know the Secretary to be a man with a great heart and a just man. If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs can assist in straightening this out and in stopping the practice, even if he has to introduce and pass a special act, he will be doing justice to the boys of this country, to their parents, to the country, and for the honor and dignity of the Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. As the point of order is conceded, that disposes of the amendment. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordnance and ordnance stores: For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material; for the armament of ships; for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work of the Ordnance Department; for furniture at naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, and proving grounds; for necessary improvements at and maintenance of proving grounds, powder factory, torpedo stations, gun factory, ammunition depots, and armor and projectile plant, and for target practice; for the maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes at naval ammunition depots, naval proving grounds, and naval torpedo stations, and for pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and naval ammunition depots: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, watchmen, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and naval ammunition depots for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, shall not exceed \$2,950,000; in all, \$24,194,045: *Provided*, That ordnance materials procured under the various ordnance appropriations shall hereafter be available for issue, to meet the general needs of the naval service, under the appropriation from which procured.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PADGETT. First, I want to offer a slight amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized, after which the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. PADGETT. On page 39, at the end of line 14, in the second proviso, the word "further" should be inserted after the word "Provided."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 39, line 14, after the word "Provided," insert the word "further."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, when I first heard of the so-called British tank I was very much interested, and it set me to thinking. There was something familiar about the machine. When I saw it yesterday afternoon for the first time it set me to thinking again, and I recalled a bit of history in the legislation of this House that I was present at the making of when I had service on the Committee on Military Affairs. It was in the year 1912, six years ago, that an American citizen came before the Committee on Military Affairs and strongly urged the construction of about 8,000 armored cars. He was slightly extravagant in his expectations of what we should do, although at that time it was not contemplated that they should be so big as they are now. He recommended the construction of 8,000 armored cars, which were the British tank of to-day, except not grown to such huge proportions as this hideous monster that we saw here yesterday. Now, a prophet is not without honor save in his own country, but I shall endeavor to do that man a little bit of justice by putting into the RECORD, with the consent of the House, a brief document, only two pages of print, which shows that in 1912 this precise instrument of destruction that has caused such a sensation in military circles in the last two of three years was forecasted and requested as an effective instrument of war.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take up the time to read any part of this now, because I want to use my five minutes otherwise, but with the privilege of putting it into the RECORD. There is one other bit of work that was suggested by that man in connection with the use of those armored cars, to which I specially invite the attention of the House.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have not the time.

Mr. SLOAN. I just wanted to know whether the caterpillar tractor was in his scheme of affairs.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not remember about that, but it was the armored car with everything, perhaps, except the track on which it runs. I read now from what he said:

It is recognized that such cars would be destroyed by a 3-inch or larger unexploded shell penetrating their armor, the same as field guns would be destroyed; but the probabilities of being damaged in this way would be very small, because when discovered they could be changed to new positions, while cloth targets of the same size and colors could be left to exhaust the enemy's supply of ammunition and discourage him from continuing such attacks.

I believe that that is the first reference that I have ever heard, I believe it is the first reference made, to what we now commonly call camouflage, with variations as to pronunciation. This reference to camouflage was made by this same American citizen, Mr. Willard S. Isham, who also suggested the armored car that has been developed into the British tank of to-day.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman also permit the suggestion there that this same man, Isham, who has appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs a number of times—

Mr. SLAYDEN. For several years.

Mr. ANTHONY. For several years has been battling with both departments of the Navy and War, to my knowledge, for the last 10 years, in order to secure the adoption of the principle of the high-explosive shell as against the armor-piercing shell.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. ANTHONY. And has been designated by those departments as a crank, but the present war has demonstrated that he was absolutely right on the principle of the high-explosive shell.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas permit me to suggest something there?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to use a little of my own time. I yield on the condition that I can get an extension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to do with this controversy as to the relative merits of the armor-piercing shells and the high-explosive shells. I only wish that the British Navy could get an opportunity oftener and under better circumstances to test the relative value of the two shells, either one of which I hope will be effective; but undoubtedly Mr. Isham, during those years I refer to, when my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] and I were colleagues on the committee, was advocating the high-explosive shell, which I believe has demonstrated its value in war.

There is one other thing that that man was doing during those times. He had also discovered a plan for making what he called a diving shell or projectile. It was a projectile that would go down into the water and then explode. That was the ancestor, direct and immediate, not so very remote, of the depth bomb that is now used, the same principle precisely. He has patents on it, I believe. Anyway, he invented and recommended and urged on the attention of the committee of Congress the procurement of a depth shell.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Just a moment.

Mr. PADGETT. The depth bomb is entirely different from the diving shell. The diving shell is intended to be shot out of a gun and ricochet, and the depth bomb is just rolled off the side of the ship and the ship runs away from it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. In one case you shoot at the bird and in the other you try to get on top of him and drop salt on his tail. That is the distinction. The way the harm is done to the enemy is by the explosion of the shell after you get it in the water. How you deliver it against the sides of the ship or in the vicinity of the enemy's ship I think is not of so very great importance. The most important thing is to get it there. This man did urge that thing at that time, and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that as a simple act of justice to an American inventor, who was something of a prophet, who had a vision, this statement ought to be made. The fact that he has been classed as a crank by the people whom my friend from Kansas quoted is not against him. He is in good company. Mr. S. F. B. Morse, Mr. Eads, Ericsson, Langley, Edison, and other men who have made great epoch-making discoveries were also cranks,

and I congratulate any man who gets into that class. He has certainly secured a place in the hall of fame.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing this pamphlet.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

ARMORED CARS.

To the House Committee on Military Affairs.

GENTLEMEN: Your attention is respectfully directed to the urgency of greatly strengthening our mobile Army and also to the ease with which this can be accomplished by means of armored cars capable of containing and protecting behind armor plate the highly trained men composing the Army while still further increasing their offensive power and mobility.

It is recognized that the functions of this committee are limited primarily to matters pertaining to the mobile Army, but it is also recognized that if our Navy can prevent a hostile army from entering our borders there is little need for an Army, while if it can not do this the necessity for a powerful Army is imminent. Hence a few facts relative to the weakness of our Navy as a deterrent to foreign invasion are considered germane and are introduced as a necessary part of this presentation.

A glance at the statistical records of the development in the navies of the leading great powers show that all countries save the United States possess and are rapidly constructing fast battleships of about 28 knots speed armed with the most powerful guns. These ships are constructed, as stated in tactical journals, to sweep the seas of slower vessels possessing lighter armament. That they can do this is universally admitted. Hence, it is evident that were we forced into war with any foreign power our scouts, cruisers, and torpedo fleets could not fulfill their most important function, that of finding and watching an enemy, without incurring the risk of almost certain destruction. It is therefore obvious that these ships must remain between the lines of our slower battleships; meanwhile an enemy's fast scout ships employing wireless telegraphy could direct the movement of a fleet of transports to its destination without risk of discovery. Hence, our Navy to-day does not afford any obstacle to the movement of foreign transports. A landing effected on our borders would force us to an aggressive warfare, to meet which a glance at the statistical records of the armies of different countries is even less reassuring to us than a comparison by navies, and compel us to admit that in the number of men and guns our Army is woefully behind that of any foreign power and hence we could not hope for it as now equipped to protect this country from an invasion which our Navy is powerless to prevent. Hence the necessity for a great increase in the strength of our mobile Army if it and our other lines of defense are being maintained for the purpose of either affording us or convincing other powers of our security against foreign attack.

This brings us to the practical consideration of the means to be employed to secure the required increase in strength. The cost of maintaining soldiers in the field in the United States is greater than in any other country. Therefore to enable us to meet the military competition of these countries as we do their industrial competition, we should increase the efficiency of our soldiers by giving them a superiority of equipment and machinery as is done in the shops and factories of this country. This can be accomplished by placing the men, or a portion of them who use the military rifle, in bullet-proof armored cars capable of operating on any terrain. These cars will be provided with telescopes and range finders to discover an enemy and determine his range. Without this equipment, which soldiers can not carry, ammunition will be wasted and the results will be a minimum, since in war there are no target men to signal that a shot is low or high and without which, even on the target range, no results could be secured. The weight of such cars, with a crew of five men, should not exceed 5,000 pounds to enable them to easily pass over bad roads. These should be provided with at least 25-horsepower motors geared down to truck speed and should be provided with a winch head and cable to enable them to pull themselves or other cars or material across an otherwise impassable slough or stream or up even the steepest and most impassable of slopes. By means of such cars covered on all sides by one-fourth inch armor plate a zone of fire might be safely entered and the advance of an enemy checked, and field material might be advanced or retired to secure better results or to save it from capture. A tactical move proven to be impossible with horses by the Russo-Japanese War. Acting as fire-control and observation stations, the fire of artillery and the movement of forces could be directed, and the operations of an enemy could be watched with safety. At night the automatic guns in these cars could be set to sweep roads and rake the barbed-wire entanglements. If surrounded by an enemy, they could be fired on with impunity by friends, since their armor would be impervious on all sides. Hence the danger of being crushed by a night attack, the bugbear of raw troops, would be absolutely eliminated by such cars.

It is recognized that such cars would be destroyed by a 3-inch or larger unexploded shell penetrating their armor, the same as field guns would be destroyed; but the probabilities of being damaged in this way would be very small, because when discovered they could be changed to new positions, while cloth targets of the same size and color could be left to exhaust the enemy's supply of ammunition and discourage him from continuing such attacks. If the argument of vulnerability is of any value against these cars, it applies with overwhelming force against the use of artillery, which can not be moved from its position and saved when its location has been determined and artillery has begun its destruction. It may be argued that these cars would become stalled in sloughs and time would be lost. If this were true and was an objection to their use, in view of their advantages each battery of five cars working together and forming a unit should be accompanied by a 6-horse team to pull them across such places until they enter the zones of fire, after which they would be compelled to select passable routes. Hence, lack of mobility is not a valid argument against the use of armored cars of this description, since they can move with horses anywhere that artillery can move and, moreover, and what is infinitely more important, can leave a sheltered position and move to attack at a critical moment or change to a new position under fire when artillery could not move.

Scattered and concealed along the line of battle, perhaps sheltered behind natural or artificial protection from which they could rush out and overwhelm any advance, they become a guaranty against the

advance of any enemy however strong or well trained. If our Army is now able to do this without such means, what would be the unnecessary cost to us in our best blood and what would be the subsequent cost in treasure to properly recompense for such unnecessary sacrifice. The records of all modern wars show that about 95 per cent of the casualties of battle have resulted from the rifle bullet. Can any consideration of cost be brought against the use of armored cars that would prevent this 95 per cent of casualties, especially when the efficiency of the men in the cars would be correspondingly increased? These are a few of the reasons why such cars should be purchased at once. The cost of 8,000 of these cars, enough to contain our entire Infantry and Cavalry forces in this country, would be less than a single battleship and would make this country impregnable against the attack of any nation or combination of nations. These cars possess no untried elements that need to be tested to determine their practicability. Hence, at least two batteries of five cars each should be purchased at once and their operations observed in the maneuvers of the Army during the present year to determine whether horses will be required with them and to establish their tactical uses in order that the number required for the service may be determined and appropriated for at an early date. It is therefore requested that this committee authorize the expenditure by the Secretary of War of \$50,000 for the purchase of 10 cars fulfilling the requirements herein described and forming part of their specifications.

I am, respectfully,

WILLARD S. ISHAM.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to state the Committee on Naval Affairs in the several years past has appropriated and the department has expended more than \$300,000 in testing the high-explosive shell. There is no lack of trying to develop it. We have appropriated and expended more than that amount of money on that shell.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to substantiate in part what the chairman of the committee has just said. I think that Congress has been very liberal with the gentleman whose name was just mentioned by my good friend from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] as being the originator of an idea. He did have an idea for a retarded-action fuse. They are calling it a diving shell to-day. He had a good idea, which has since been very largely developed by the Navy Department, and because the Navy Department has developed it he believes that the Government should pay him for what the department has done.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I just want to say to the gentleman that I know nothing about the controversy or contention on the part of Isham that the Government owes him anything for infringing on his idea, but my object was only to establish one or two interesting facts of history.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Isham called at my office this morning and said that certain Members were going to talk about his shell to-day. I believe he is contending for some money from the Navy Department.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I desire to explain to the gentleman the point I am trying to make. I know nothing about that; I have not talked with Mr. Isham about that; I would refuse to talk with him or anybody else on that subject. I know nothing about the contention between him and the Government as to payment for any infringement of his patent, but my reason for speaking here was to establish the fact that years ago, before there was any dispute between him and the Government, Mr. Isham was contending for the same thing, and at the same time he suggested what we now call as camouflage.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am willing to agree with my good friend from Texas that Mr. Isham has a wonderful brain and the greatest imagination possible.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And the gentleman says the Navy Department developed his ideas?

Mr. BRITTEN. His ideas on the retarded-action fuse are all right, but he never developed anything, and he is complaining now because the Navy Department may have developed his ideas and should pay him a bonus for having done so.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I thought the gentleman said they had developed them.

Mr. BRITTEN. Not fully.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I thought the gentleman stated as a fact that they had developed them.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; they have to a very great degree.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not want to deny the gentleman's knowledge of technical matters connected with the Navy of which he knows a great deal more than I do, but it has been brought to my attention by a man who claims to know what he is talking about that the reason for German domination of many of the battle fields of Europe has been by reason of their advanced use of the high-explosive shell.

Mr. BRITTEN. I think the gentleman is entirely correct, but he is talking about land battles. This retarded-action fuse for which Mr. Isham claimed so much applied to a high-explosive shell that was to be used in the Navy.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman permit me to say in justice to this man Isham that years ago, four or six years ago,

when he was appearing before committees pleading for adoption of the high-explosive shell, the experts of the Ordnance Department were contending that they were unable to use the high-explosive shell for big guns for fear of the charge bursting; that it could not be used safely at certain temperatures. Now, the Germans have accepted the principle of that same explosive shell. In all the armies on the battle fields of Europe they are using the high-explosive shell.

The effect on ships of all classes of underwater explosion, whether of shells, torpedoes, or mines, during this war has been uniformly of a most serious nature. If they have not been sunk immediately, in every case the effect has been such as to destroy their fighting efficiency, and since the diving shell and fuse invented by Mr. Isham has been available for years, and merely required the cooperation of the department to have had it in use in the navies of our allies as well as our own, it is interesting to think what might have been the results in this war and especially in a certain indecisive naval engagement had such fuses been employed, which would also have made all the shells striking short of the ships veritable mines. The same is true of the armored car, and it is likewise true that Germany had prepared herself by storing up high-explosive shells and big guns to shoot them while other countries declared such shells and guns to be useless.

Mr. BRITTEN. What the gentleman says merely demonstrates once more the fact that the Navy always goes ahead of the Army. When the gentleman's committee or the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance of the Army refused to consider these important ideas the Navy Department was spending money to demonstrate the value of the Isham idea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval proving ground: For increasing facilities for the proof and test of ordnance material, including necessary buildings, construction, equipment, railroad facilities, land, and damages and losses to persons, firms, and corporations, resulting from the procurement of the land for this purpose, and also all necessary expenses incident to the procurement of said land, \$1,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that paragraph. It has already been enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAYS). The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment to strike out the paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Bureau of Ordnance: For miscellaneous items, namely, cartage, expenses of light and water at ammunition depots and stations, tolls, ferrage, technical books, and incidental expenses attending inspection of ordnance material, \$9,500.

Mr. BRITTEN. Before we leave the paragraph I would like to say just a few words about the care that was given by the Navy to some of the German merchant ships that were recently taken over by our Government. The one I have particularly in mind is the former steamer *Vaterland*, now called the *Leviathan*. I think the House may be interested to know that when one of the big German ships steamed past Governors Island some months ago on her way with our troops to Europe, a German who was interned there rubbed his eyes in amazement and said, "Is not that the German ship *So-and-so*?" When he was told that it was, he said, "Why, I was on that ship, and it can not be possible that the American Government has repaired it in this short time. I myself broke certain flanges that I was sure could not be repaired within 8 or 10 months." He said, "That ship is now going out under an American flag."

When I was in New York last year I went over the *Vaterland* and saw some of the destruction that had been wrought by the Germans before they left the ship. Apparently irreparable damage had been done, but with our usual ingenuity we developed new processes with great success. Electrical welding was used, and that enormous ship was put into commission at less than 50 per cent of the cost estimated by a committee of expert engineers, who had determined that the damage on this single ship would cost in the neighborhood of \$850,000.

It is interesting to know that the *Vaterland* was a ship of 56,000 tons, was 944 feet long—in other words, almost twice as long as the Washington Monument is high. If stood on her stern she would overtop the Woolworth Building, in New York, by 200 feet. Because of the height of her smokestacks she could not get under the Brooklyn Bridge, and she had to be docked at Hoboken. Her speed was 26 knots, and she cost the German Government \$30,000,000. She had 14 separate decks. In other words, the steamer was 14 stories high; 46 boilers required a crew of 350 men in the engine room; and she carried 9,000 tons of coal—think of it, 9,000 tons of coal fuel. Her operation required four captains and one commodore. She had made only two trips as a passenger ship when the European war broke out.

She had 18 different sets of elevators, 530 electrically equipped clocks, all of them wound and set by a master clock in the commodore's office. She contained a great wonderful Venetian swimming pool of marble, one of the most wonderful pools to be found anywhere on earth, much less on a ship. The ceiling of the dining room was not quite so high as the Hall of this House but it was an enormous room that resembled very much the largest dining room in the largest and finest hotels of our country. There were no great columns in the center of the room. The ceiling was finely arched.

The principal repair work on this ship was done under Commander E. P. Jessop, for whose ability I have a very high regard and who should have been attached to that ship as its first commander. He was ably assisted by Lieut. Commander McWhorter. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact, and it applies to all of the German ships, that these repairs were made within from 10 to 15 per cent of the time it was ordinarily expected it would take, and the ships were put on the high seas and are now in the transport service.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Were those damages done to those ships before the declaration of war?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. I was very much interested in the gentleman's several statements of fact, but the first was of main importance and significance. That was the surprise in the heart of the interned German at what America was able to accomplish. Does the gentleman not think that he made on a small scale the same mistake as to the capacity of America and Americans that his Kaiser has been making up to this time?

Mr. BRITTEN. I sincerely hope so.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks, namely, for books, maps, models, and drawings; purchase and repair of fire engines; fire apparatus and plants; machinery, operation or repair, purchase; maintenance of horses and driving teams; carts, timber wheels, and all vehicles, including motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes, and including motor-propelled vehicles for freight-carrying purposes only for use in the navy yards; tools and repair of the same; stationery; furniture for Government houses and offices in navy yards and naval stations; coal and other fuel; candles, oil, and gas; attendance on light and power plants; cleaning and clearing up yards and care of buildings; attendance on fires, lights, fire engines, and fire apparatus and plants; incidental labor at navy yards; water tax, tolls, and ferriage; pay of watchmen in navy yards; awnings and packing boxes; and for pay of employees on leave, \$7,000,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, messenger, and other classified work in the navy yards and naval stations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, shall not exceed \$2,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PADGETT offers the following committee amendment: Page 42, at the end of line 18, add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the purchase of more than 75 passenger-carrying automobiles for official use within the United States and its insular possessions: *And provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the purchase of such passenger-carrying automobiles at a greater cost than \$500 each: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to distribute the high-powered automobiles now owned and in use in the United States and its insular possessions to such places and service as they may be required."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest a modification of the amendment. The first "*Provided*" ought to be "*Provided further*."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a division on this amendment, so that I may have an opportunity of voting against it. I would like very much to have it appear in the Record, so that I can use it hereafter, so that no question may arise as to my position. I want to vote against the amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Would the gentleman object to telling us why?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I do, because it would take a lot of time.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But we want some information.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, I can give the gentleman the information while walking out in the corridor and not take up the time now. There will be no use of objecting to it. I did object to it, and I am the only one.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, no. The gentleman is mistaken there. Mr. BUTLER. I am wrong about that, but the gentleman was not there when the thing happened.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment. My good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] has just called attention to the fact that he is opposed to the amendment, but he does not desire to take the time of the House to explain his position. I think it is only fair, if a vote is to be taken, that we know what this amendment contemplates.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me for a moment I shall make a statement that I think will clarify the situation.

Mr. BRITTEN. Very well, I yield.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, under various appropriations in the bill they can purchase automobiles. We had an investigation of the matter, and we found there had been purchased heretofore a number of automobiles for which they were paying from \$1,500 to more than \$3,000 each. They have on hand a number of automobiles. They need more for the war, but the committee felt there should be a limitation on the number that should be purchased, and after investigation we fixed the number at 75, but we also put in a limitation that they shall not purchase an automobile at a higher cost than \$500. They were purchasing some at \$3,000, some above \$3,000, and some at \$2,500. We think they have enough of the high-priced machines, and we asked the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Admiral Parks, if it would hinder or interfere with the operations if they were limited to the purchase of machines not to cost above \$500, and to use the high-powered machines they have now by redistributing them where they needed the high-powered machines, and he said it would not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What automobile can they get in the United States for \$500 or less?

Mr. PADGETT. The Ford.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And this means then that they are ordered to purchase 75 Ford machines?

Mr. PADGETT. Not more than 75. They have a great many, and they estimated for about 100 Ford machines. They are using them, and they say to us in the beginning they were ordering high-powered machines from abroad, but now they are asking for Fords.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COX. Who is to use these machines; the officers, or are they to be used in the transportation of enlisted men?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; they are to be used in work between the yards and stations.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does the gentleman know how many machines there are in use?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; we have that here; we have a statement here. I believe there are 234.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And this will add how many to that number?

Mr. PADGETT. Seventy-five. They made an estimate for four more. There are 232.

Mr. BUTLER. During what period have they been purchased?

Mr. PADGETT. A great many have been purchased since the war began.

Mr. BUTLER. Out of the lump appropriation?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and they had a number of them before the war began; but the committee felt that there should be a limitation placed upon the price to be paid for these machines, and we asked Admiral Parks upon two different occasions if a limitation on the purchase of these machines be put at \$500 would it embarrass the service, and he said it would not; that they could distribute the ones they have—the high-powered, faster machines—to places where they are actually needed.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Are those all passenger automobiles?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What possible use can they have for so many passenger machines?

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will bear in mind that we have in this country something like 400 navy yards and air stations, and some big ones, like New York, Philadelphia, and other places where there are yards and docks, steam engineering, and construction and repair, and all those various activities

going on, they require 7, 8, or 10 machines at some of those places.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Do they apportion the number of automobiles according to the number of ships, or use the automobiles on the ships or some place else?

Mr. PADGETT. They use them at the navy yards and the naval stations.

Mr. MADDEN. Why did the committee designate some particular make of automobile?

Mr. PADGETT. We did not designate any particular make.

Mr. MADDEN. It is the same thing; you might as well as to make specifications that would not apply to anything else in the world.

Mr. PADGETT. But it is an impossibility to put a limitation without including somebody and excluding somebody else.

Mr. BUTLER. There are several makes of machines that sell for less than \$500.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment pending—substitute \$1,500 for \$500 in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment: Strike out "\$500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500."

Mr. BRITTEN. Now, here is the situation, gentlemen: The Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks provides automobiles where they are deemed necessary in the interest of the service. We have established aviation bases along the Atlantic coast. There are a great many of them. Some of you would be surprised to know how many aviation bases and patrol stations we have established along the Atlantic coast and where the use of automobiles is necessary. Every big navy yard requires automobiles; many of them for inspection purposes and to go into the country where mechanical parts are being manufactured for seaplanes and for ships, and to-day we are going to say to commandants, who have at their disposal millions of dollars of Government money—men on whose honesty we are depending to expend that money judiciously in the interests of the Government—we are going to say, "Here, Capt. So-and-So, here are several million dollars; go and take an option on land adjoining a navy yard, as we have in Washington; buy this land as cheaply as you can and save the Government every dollar you can, but when it is necessary to go away from your yard and the Government provides an automobile, we can not give you anything but a Ford—a 'tin Lizzie.'" And that is not all.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I will.

Mr. COX. That will take them there and bring them back.

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. In a moment. On the front door of that car you must have in great big letters, in complete contrast with the color of the car, according to an order issued by the Secretary of the Navy, the words "For official use only." That is on the front door.

On the second door you must have a great big coat of arms about so high, almost as big as the door itself, and the words "United States Government," for fear that this man who has charge of the investment of millions and millions of dollars might use that car to go down to attend to some little personal business, such as buying a collar or a pair of shoes. We expect that man to be honest, we expect him to spend millions of dollars of Government money just as if it were his own and trust him to do so, and then we turn around and say that we are too poor to furnish for official use anything but a little Ford.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Let me talk for a moment on the amendment, if you please, and then I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. In a moment.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that a very proper place to put the question I want to propound.

Mr. BRITTEN. Go ahead.

Mr. MADDEN. I was wondering whether my colleague was afraid that when an officer was compelled to ride in a Ford that there would not be room enough to prevent his braid from being soiled, whereas if he got a palatial car costing \$1,500 it might be possible for him to sit back to have some shade, so he could keep his uniform from being hurt. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. I am so abashed that I can not even reply to my handsome colleague from Illinois. [Laughter.] Why does

he not ride in one of these \$1,500 "palatial" cars instead of having one made especially for his use at a price of \$5,000 or \$6,000?

Mr. MADDEN. But I pay for mine.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will yield now to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX. Could they not ride as quickly in a Ford as in a \$1,500 car?

Mr. BRITTEN. Probably; but not so reliably.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman does not mean to contend that the only people who ride in these cars are commanding officers? The gentleman knows that at these naval stations the men ride in them, and in the case of the reserve the boys have joy rides in them occasionally.

Mr. BRITTEN. Can the gentleman recite an instance of that kind for the benefit of the House? I will give the gentleman the time in which to do it.

Mr. WALSH. I do not know that the gentleman can yield me in five minutes sufficient time to do that. I know that at one Naval Reserve station a man enlisted in the Naval Reserve took with him a splendid car, and his entire duty was to sit in that car from morning until night—

Mr. BRITTEN. To keep somebody from stealing it?

Mr. WALSH. Sitting by himself until the officer above him wanted to go somewhere; and when on a Sunday that car was not needed it was turned over to the officers or to the men for use in pleasure rides.

Mr. BRITTEN. Was it a Government car?

Mr. WALSH. It was his own car.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to dispose of this bill this afternoon.

Mr. BRITTEN. I wish to proceed, Mr. Chairman, for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. My object in establishing a \$1,500 price is to give some leeway to the Navy Department in the purchase of these cars. There may be cases where a good car can be had for \$1,500 or less. There should be a certain amount of dignity to go with an office that carries a big salary and is of very great importance, and I think we ought to accommodate the office with a car commensurate with its dignity. One thousand five hundred dollars will permit that; \$500 will not.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I have actually seen Members of Congress riding in a Ford.

Mr. EMERSON. I walk.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, before the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs finishes his argument I want it to appear in this Record why I vote against this sort of thing. It is because of the manner of treatment of enlisted men of the service. I do not think we should use the enlisted men on these machines, either as chauffeurs or footmen. We have no real right to employ these men, who enlisted to fight and to soldier, for such a purpose as this, and therefore I will not vote for any automobile that is operated and cared for by honorably enlisted men.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How are you going to get along with the 232 that are now in use?

Mr. BUTLER. I did not know they were purchased. I will not vote to maintain them. I want it to be perfectly plain in the Record, so that hereafter, if I am here, I may have an opportunity to cut this thing up from the bottom. I can not do it now. I might just as well stay out of the committee room. I am useless. I am opposed to spending \$1,200 every year in the maintenance of each of these automobiles.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I confess that I am at an utter loss to understand the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, that he might as well stay out of the committee room and that he is powerless, because I think that everybody in the committee is consulted, and things are decided by the majority.

Mr. BUTLER. There is no question about that. I have not the slightest criticism. I want to say to the chairman that I only regret that my advice has not been accepted by anybody. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. I stated that we had on hand 232 automobiles in the various yards in the United States.

Mr. JUUL. How many?

Mr. PADGETT. Two hundred and thirty-two. We have about 400 stations of various kinds. Some of them use auto-

mobiles, some not. At some of the larger stations, like New York, using a number of machines, or Philadelphia and Norfolk, all places of that kind that require the use of seven or eight machines, that is proper. Now, they have been purchasing these machines out of lump-sum appropriations. A large number of them have been purchased since the war began. They will need more machines. They have got to have some abroad for use at these air stations. This limitation only applies to the United States. We do not contemplate—and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] agrees with me fully as to that—

Mr. BUTLER. Absolutely; the best that can be had.

Mr. PADGETT. We do not contemplate purchasing the large number of machines for use at home, so that this limitation is drawn to limit the purchase to the United States, leaving the number abroad in the various stations there unlimited.

Mr. COX. If the limitation is not agreed to, how high could they pay for automobiles?

Mr. PADGETT. They have been paying as high as \$3,500, and the price has now gone up to \$4,000, as I understand.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can understand the necessity of having these automobiles around at our naval stations, covering several hundred acres, where a lot of time would be lost in walking around, but what do they want them abroad for? What use can they make of them abroad?

Mr. PADGETT. We have air stations there, and we have got to go up and down and preserve the service over there. We will not overstep the limit.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. My friend from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] remarks that automobiles do not go up and down.

Mr. PADGETT. They go up and down the coast, looking after the air service. I have asked Admiral Park, the chief of the bureau which has general supervision, if this limitation limiting the purchase to these cheaper cars and allowing them to distribute a large number of high-priced cars to those places where they need higher-powered cars would impair the service, and he said that it would not. Later on in the examination I took the matter up again with him and said, "Now, after you have had time to think it over, do you still adhere to the statement that you gave me a while ago, that it will not hamper the service or interfere with it?" He said, "I do." Now, the idea was they wanted 50 cars at \$2,500 each. I do not think they ought to purchase 50 cars at \$2,500 each. I think the official service can be performed by the use of cars not exceeding \$500 each, and that is why I have put in this limitation upon the purchase.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, who has been here for a great many years, how these naval officers managed to get around to the department and navy yards before the automobile was invented?

Mr. FARR. In the same way that all the rest of us did.

Mr. PADGETT. Before the automobile came into use our Navy was very small, the yards were limited in their activities, and the comparison of activities then to now would be almost as 1 to 25 or 30.

Mr. BRITTEN. And the Government provided horses and carriages?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Some time ago a visitor in the galleries made this very searching observation: "I notice that when a small appropriation is discussed it takes a good deal of time, but when there is a \$10,000,000 appropriation discussed, it is done very briefly." He wanted to know why that was. I wish he might be here to-day.

On page 39 of this bill is an appropriation of \$26,500,000; another one on the same page of \$2,400,000; one on page 40, with reference to the new batteries for ships of the Navy, \$48,000,000; on the same page, ammunition for vessels, \$39,000,000; on the same page, torpedoes and appliances, \$1,000,000; also reserve ordnance supplies, \$50,000,000; totaling probably \$170,000,000. All these appropriations required very little discussion. But here is a case of a Ford automobile that has required discussion something like 30 minutes. If I were to undertake to answer his query, why we spend so much time on the small appropriations and so little time on the large ones, I would be at a loss, unless it would be that we all know something about the Ford and would like to give the public our valuable contribution on the Ford, while on these larger items we do not know enough about them to give any information of value. Whether that be true or not, it is a comment, it seems to me, upon the legislative

body becoming so enthusiastic and taking so much time on matters of whether, for example, the Secretary of State should have an automobile or whether the Speaker of the House should have a Ford, or this kind or that kind of a car—items of prior appropriation bills which have held this House for hours in heated debate in other days. While it is not my habit to inject anything in the form of a lecture, which I would not be guilty of, that observation was made by a visitor in the gallery not long ago. He is not here to-day, and I am not making this observation for that purpose, but just to call attention of the House to the fact that an appropriation of \$170,000,000 has been adopted without debate and little observation. It does not take much time to decide on items of mammoth drains on the Treasury, while an appropriation for a Ford automobile takes a great deal of time, in which the entire membership of the House becomes absorbed.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did the gentleman ever buy a Ford automobile?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. Let us vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is called for. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. PADGETT. I wish to offer an amendment just after the caption "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 43, after line 1, insert the following as a separate paragraph:

Hospital construction: For additional temporary hospital construction and repairs as may be necessary at the points named herein and to provide same with suitable hospital facilities, Chelsea, Mass., \$350,000; Newport, R. I., \$500,000; New London, Conn., \$150,000; Brooklyn, N. Y., \$1,400,000; Wards Island, N. Y., \$1,250,000; Pelham, N. Y., \$900,000; Philadelphia, Pa., \$355,000; League Island, Pa., \$800,000; Norfolk, Va., \$1,250,000; Hampton Roads, Va., \$500,000; Charleston, S. C., \$850,000; Paris Island, S. C., \$175,000; Great Lakes, Ill., \$65,000; Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$150,000; overseas, \$1,000,000; contingent, \$600,000; in all, \$10,295,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I shall be very glad to.

Mr. WALSH. I want to ask if any of the appropriation proposed in this amendment is to be available for the establishment of naval hospitals at points other than those mentioned.

Mr. PADGETT. They are mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. There is a large contingent appropriation.

Mr. PADGETT. That contingent is to take care of general unknown and undeveloped things that may come up at these places.

Mr. WALSH. At these various places?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Heretofore there have been appropriations made for these various points, have there?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; they have activities going on there now. A great deal of it was under lump-sum appropriations, and much of it was under appropriations carried in the deficiency bills heretofore.

Mr. WALSH. There was nothing carried in the last naval appropriation bill by way of specific appropriations?

Mr. PADGETT. Not for this particular purpose at that time. There was something given for this in the deficiency bill.

Mr. WALSH. Could any part of the moneys appropriated here be utilized for enlargement of the buildings?

Mr. PADGETT. Some of it is for new buildings, some of it for improvement and enlargement and additions, so as to put more beds in these hospitals, and other facilities to take care of the larger number of patients.

Mr. WALSH. And it includes the maintenance appropriation as well?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. Has the gentleman any explanation to offer why only \$65,000 is contained in the amendment for hospital facilities for the Great Lakes, while over \$2,000,000 is carried for hospital facilities in the State of New York?

Mr. PADGETT. Because at the Great Lakes the hospitals there have been developed, and we have spent in hospitals there between two and three million dollars already, and this was simply a little additional work. I want to say that the committee

gave a special hearing to Dr. Braisted, the Surgeon General, and we have printed the hearings. He went into this very carefully, and I think he has administered the medical department and hospital service with extraordinary and very commendable economy and efficiency. I believe every member of the committee will cheerfully bear me out in that statement.

Mr. JUUL. And the gentleman thinks the hospital facilities at the Great Lakes are quite ample?

Mr. PADGETT. They have tremendous ones there. I might state at this point that we have a provision to come in later on, an amendment, to authorize the taking over the purchase of the land on which we have spent two or three million dollars at the Great Lakes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. As I heard the amendment read, it proposes an aggregate expenditure of \$10,000,000 or more?

Mr. PADGETT. About that; but it is distributed in different places.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And the items are of very great importance, some of them?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. When was the hearing had upon this amendment?

Mr. BROWNING. On April 11. Here it is.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The bill was reported March 10?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How came it that during all these weeks of investigation as to what appropriations would be necessary for the Navy Department, an item which is to involve the expenditure of \$10,000,000 was not inquired into, at least to the extent of having any hearing before the committee, until almost a month after the bill was reported?

Mr. PADGETT. The matter is very easy to explain. The estimate was sent, first, to the Appropriations Committee for inclusion in the deficiency appropriation bill. They did include a small amount of it, and Mr. SHERLEY, the chairman of that committee, came to me and said that these matters did not belong properly as deficiencies, that they were original items and should be stricken out, and he disallowed them in the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. When was this matter referred to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. PADGETT. Early in the session, I think. I do not remember. The Senate added an amendment increasing it by \$5,000,000 and something, and in the conference the House conferees, as Mr. SHERLEY informs me, disagreed to the Senate amendment because they said it was a matter to go before the Naval Committee for inclusion in the naval bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This is \$5,000,000 of the \$10,000,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; something about \$5,000,000, and the demands and the developments of the war, the proposed increase in this bill, which has already passed in the committee, adding \$78,000 to the Navy and \$45,500 to the Marine Corps, necessitate a provision for larger care.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. So that Surg. Gen. Braisted could not know until after Congress had required these increases what the necessities would demand?

Mr. PADGETT. He could not tell beforehand.

Mr. BRITTEN. Answering the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], it is a fact that the Surgeon General of the Army and the Surgeon General of the Navy have just made an agreement for establishing a uniform number of cubic feet of air space for each man in the Army and the Navy. That has been done only recently and because of that agreement greater quarters were required, and a lot of this money will go into the construction of hospitals because of the increase in the number of cubic feet per man.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Money of the public could not be expended for a better purpose.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask a question. I understand that this appropriation is intended for the construction of permanent buildings and improvements. Is that true?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it is specified as temporary, but the character of the building, I want to say, will be such that it will be available for use, if cared for, for 25 or 30 years or more, depend-

ing upon climatic conditions and the upkeep, the painting, keeping it in the proper state of repair.

Mr. McKENZIE. My purpose in asking that question is this: Of course we all understand now that the Navy is a very large institution, and a great many men are to be taken care of. The permanent structures, of course, will be intended to take care of the Navy in time of peace.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. This is wood construction, but the material selected is of a good class, so that it will not be ramshackle and fall down, and they stated that while it is of this temporary character in that sense of the word, it will be permanent in the sense that it will serve for a number of years.

Mr. McKENZIE. And to a large extent the purpose of it is to take care of the emergency now existing.

Mr. PADGETT. The necessity of the present demands it; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Addition to machine shop, \$200,000; addition to foundry, \$130,000; power-plant improvements, \$150,000; in all, \$480,000.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 43, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following as a separate paragraph:

"Submarine base, New London, Conn.: For the further development of the submarine base at New London, Conn., including erection and equipment of repair shops, the provision of additional berthing space, and the erection of quarters and barracks for officers and men, \$750,000."

Mr. BUTLER. That is what we considered yesterday morning?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. I do not believe that it makes any difference where the item goes in, but in accordance with the order maintained throughout the bill I submit that it ought to come between lines 7 and 8, following the coast on down.

Mr. PADGETT. There are no items of that character, and it could be inserted at any point, so far as the geographical situation is concerned.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Boston, Mass.: Improvement of central power plant, \$75,000.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer an amendment on line 7, page 43.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 7, strike out "\$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$425,000."

Mr. BUTLER. Is that a committee amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it was agreed to yesterday. It is for enlargement of the power plant and capacities at the Boston Navy Yard.

Mr. BUTLER. The thing went through so fast yesterday I did not catch on.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is not it necessary that that power plant be improved?

Mr. PADGETT. It is for the activities going on at that yard. I submitted it to the committee yesterday.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa.: Dry dock, to complete, \$2,000,000; central power-plant improvements, \$300,000; tracks, streets, and sewers, \$100,000; in all, \$2,400,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 15, at the beginning of the paragraph, before the word "for," insert the following: "depot of supplies, Philadelphia, Pa."

Mr. BUTLER. What is that?

Mr. PADGETT. It is just simply to give a title to the paragraph; that is all. There is a depot of supplies, Philadelphia, Pa., and that should be inserted before the word "for." It is just an official designation.

Mr. BUTLER. This is the beginning of something for the future. We start in with a subject in this bill known as a depot of supplies.

Mr. PADGETT. Col. Radford has been at the head of it—

Mr. BUTLER. I know, and there is no better man living than Col. Radford, but I am looking ahead for 5, 10, or 15 years.

Mr. PADGETT. In drafting the bill, that designation was left out.

Mr. BUTLER. It never did have any, I do not think. I do not recall it, if it had.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is mistaken.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balance of \$40,434.23 of appropriation of \$200,000 in the act approved June 15, 1917, making appropriations to supply deficiencies for the purchase of additional land, Depot of Supplies, Marine Corps, Philadelphia, Pa., is hereby made available for the purchase of a lot of land lying on the south side of Alter Street and beginning about 60 feet west of Broad Street in the city of Philadelphia, extending about 210 feet and 6 inches on Alter Street and extending south about 40 feet, including all buildings thereon and for adapting said buildings for uses connected with said depot.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it a committee amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; it is in answer to a communication from Col. Radford and seeks to correct a description given in the text. It is to strike out that and insert the correct description. It does not add anything to it or take anything from it, except it properly describes the land.

Mr. BUTLER. We had read that paragraph and had gone some distance on the next one. I have no objection, if the chairman wants to ask permission.

Mr. PADGETT. No; we had only got down to the top of page 44, and this is to strike out that paragraph and insert.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, on page 38, lines 18 to 27, both inclusive, and lines 1 and 2 on page 44, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"The unexpended balance of \$40,434.23 of appropriation of \$200,000 in the act approved June 15, 1917, making appropriations to supply deficiencies for the purchase of additional land, Depot of Supplies, Marine Corps, Philadelphia, Pa., is hereby made available for the purchase of all necessary land lying between Alter Street, Elsworth Street, and Fifteenth Street in the city of Philadelphia, including all buildings thereon and for adapting such buildings for uses connected with said depot."

Mr. WALSH. The purpose of this amendment is not to buy additional land than that designated?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it is to correct the boundaries and descriptions in the text that is in the bill.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman does not get my question. The purpose of this paragraph in the bill, as originally reported, is not to buy for the Government tracts of land other than that which was intended at the time the deficiency appropriation was made.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; there are some little additional lands to straighten out the boundaries, rather, and to enlarge their activities.

Mr. WALSH. How much of the suburbs of this great city will be taken over?

Mr. PADGETT. It takes over very little; it runs by feet.

Mr. WALSH. Not very many houses?

Mr. PADGETT. It is a little triangle that runs in between streets there, and this is to strike that out and give some additional frontage.

Mr. BUTLER. So as to disabuse the mind of my good friend, I desire to state it is not in my district.

Mr. EMERSON. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman a question. Coming from a State where one has to hew rigidly to the line in the matter of appropriations, I ask is not this just a little bit loose? On lines 15, 16, and 17 of page 43 is the item—

For the erection of a lumber shed and necessary railroad sidings on land now owned by the Government and occupied as a portion of the depot of supplies, \$35,000.

I want to ask this question of the gentleman: Can the men charged by law with the expenditure of this money use \$34,000 out of the \$35,000 for a shed and \$1,000 for a siding? Or is there some definition of authority somewhere telling how much you can spend for the shed and how much for the siding? You can get an awfully big shed out in my country for \$35,000.

Mr. PADGETT. The hearings had before our committee showed that they needed certain land there and certain sheds and sidings in connection with the big marine clothing factory that they have there, which is manufacturing clothing for the Marine Corps and saving the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars a year.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will pardon me, I have no objection to the appropriation, but it seems to me that the language does not read right, "For lumber shed, \$35,000, and some sidings." Would it not be better for us, in voting on a proposition like that, to know how much we are spending for the shed and how much for the siding?

Mr. PADGETT. It is impossible to go into all those details. They send the estimates down here, and the hearings disclose fully what they are for.

Mr. JUUL. I would not like to go home and explain that a shed was to cost \$35,000.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman will not have to. Nobody will ever ask him about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Washington, D. C.: Fuse and primer loading house, Bellevue magazine, \$25,000; boundary fence, Bellevue magazine, \$15,000; for the acquisition of additional land on the east side of the Naval Gun Factory lying south of M Street and west of Eleventh Street and for the removal of buildings thereon and the grading of the ground and construction of walls inclosing said land and equipping same for use, \$488,000: *Provided*, That upon the acquisition of the land hereby authorized, all portions of public streets on which any squares so taken over shall abut and lying between the same, and all public alleys within said squares, together with such portions of streets and public alleys as lie between the present navy yard and the land so acquired, are hereby abandoned and closed and said portions of said streets and public alleys shall be regarded as set apart and reserved for naval purposes; in all, \$533,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to correct a typographical error—a misprint.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PADGETT offers the following amendment: Page 44, line 5, strike out "\$15,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$20,600."

Mr. PADGETT. That does not add to the total and does not change it. It is just a misprint. The amount of money is the same. The error should be corrected, though.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire a division of the paragraph so that I can vote against a part of it.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to move to strike out the last word, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. BLACK. I did not understand that the gentleman wanted to speak.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not anything to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not desire the floor?

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how much land is contemplated to be purchased?

Mr. PADGETT. It is out here on the east side of the navy yard. It embraces that portion of the land that is south of M Street, I believe, and east of Eleventh Street. There are, I think, either three or four blocks, and the Government owns already various lots scattered all through that region. This is purchasing the remainder of the lots, and then is to extend the wall along M Street to Eleventh Street and down Eleventh Street to the river, and to take in that. It is about 6 or 7 acres, I should say. It is given as 7 acres.

Mr. BLACK. Have contracts been made for the purchase of this land?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. The authority is given to the President here to take it over and to pay for it under this general provision that we have provided for all these matters.

Mr. BLACK. The President would have the right to condemn the land if voluntary contracts could not be made? That is the point I wish to bring out.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, the Chair will entertain it. There is no provision whereby the Chair can submit the paragraph unless an amendment is offered.

Mr. BUTLER. Have we not the right to move an amendment to separate the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. No part of the appropriation in the bill is read or voted on unless some amendment is proposed. If the gentleman proposes an amendment to strike out a portion of the paragraph, the Chair will entertain the motion.

Mr. BUTLER. I move to strike out the whole paragraph in order to get a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the paragraph. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That portion of Eleventh Street SE, lying south of the south line of O Street SE, and west of the west face of the new Anacostia Bridge is hereby abandoned and closed, and said portion of said street, together with such land owned by the United States as is bounded on the north by the south line of O Street; on the east by the west face of the new Anacostia Bridge; on the south by the waters of the Anacostia River; and on the west by the west line of Eleventh Street, extending in a southerly direction from its point of intersection with the south line of O Street and prolonged to its intersection with the

waters of the Anacostia River, is hereby set apart and reserved for naval purposes and placed under the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That at all times the proper authorities of the District of Columbia shall be permitted to have access to the area above described for the purpose of making examinations of, and repairs to, the said bridge: *And provided further*, That all leases heretofore granted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to parties occupying said above-described area are hereby, in accordance with the terms of such leases, terminated.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I can state to the gentleman that it is not to purchase any land in the District of Columbia. There is a little triangle that is formed by the streets mentioned there and the river, embracing, I suppose, about a third of an acre. That is right next to the bridge; the street that goes to the bridge, and the navy yard that comes up, belongs to the District of Columbia. The authorities of the District of Columbia agree that it may be turned over to the navy yard in order to secure the safety and the protection of the navy yard and to straighten their fence and bring it out to the bridge, which is about a third of an acre. It is the water front, and the District of Columbia has been renting it out to persons as a boat landing. It is very objectionable to have anything of that kind right there at the navy yard, where we have all these activities going on in the yard. There is no purchase; just a transfer of the jurisdiction under the Navy Department.

Mr. WALSH. Is this tract to be inclosed by this fence and wall?

Mr. PADGETT. It is a different part from that. It connects with the lower part of the navy yard on the river.

Mr. WALSH. It is not to be inclosed, then?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it is to be inclosed.

Mr. WALSH. Why is the right reserved to the authorities of the District of Columbia to enter there for the purpose of examining and repairing the bridge?

Mr. PADGETT. This land goes right up to the abutment of the bridge. The bridge rests on the abutment on the bank of the river, and this land goes right up to the abutment.

Mr. WALSH. That is the Anacostia Bridge?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and it is to allow the District of Columbia, through its workmen and officials, to go upon the land to make examinations as to the state of the abutment and to make any repairs. If the bridge should get out of repair, they would need to have some place to get around under the abutment, next to the water's edge, and to do things of that kind.

Mr. WALSH. The leases referred to in the last proviso are leases to parties to utilize that property?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and I understand they have all expired. It does not interfere with them. Those leases were revocable at any time that it suited the District of Columbia. When we went out there to look at it they told us that as a matter of fact the leases had all terminated. If anyone will go out there and look at it, he will see that it is really a little nuisance that is stuck right in there, with boats and every sort of little craft coming in there and tying up, right at the corner of the navy yard.

Mr. WALSH. Now, one further question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. How much of Eleventh Street will be closed and discontinued by the adoption of this provision?

Mr. PADGETT. None whatever.

Mr. WALSH. It says, "That portion of Eleventh Street SE. is hereby abandoned and closed."

Mr. PADGETT. That is theoretically a part of Eleventh Street, but there is already a fence around this lot. Eleventh Street, theoretically runs to the water's edge, but practically does not.

Mr. WALSH. And this is the theoretical portion?

Mr. PADGETT. As a matter of fact, there is a little fence across that theoretical extension of Eleventh Street now, which cuts off the portion going down to the water's edge. It is closed by the fence and is not being used as a public street.

Mr. WALSH. The portion that will be legally abandoned will be from the water's edge—

Mr. PADGETT. Up to the fence.

Mr. WALSH. That is what I wanted to understand.

Mr. PADGETT. As I have the picture in my mind, it is a distance about as far as from here to the door from the water up to that fence.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts withdraw his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question about the preceding paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. About how much land is being acquired there?

Mr. PADGETT. About seven acres.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman know who owns it now?

Mr. PADGETT. It is owned by a number of people.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. How many buildings are on it now?

Mr. PADGETT. There are some cheap buildings, both of frame and brick, little storehouses, and so forth, on these streets.

Mr. TALBOTT. The Government already owns some of them?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I have stated that. I should suppose that there are from 20 to 40 owners.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman have any idea about how much that land is going to cost by the acre, or lot, or foot?

Mr. PADGETT. There were some hearings on it. I do not recall it just now, but this \$488,000 is estimated not only to purchase that land but to take down the buildings.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. To build a wall?

Mr. BROWNING. And level the ground.

Mr. PADGETT. To build a wall and level the ground, and put it on a level with the navy yard proper, and fix it all up.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I have no doubt of the wisdom of it, but I was trying to find out what the committee thought was the value of that land that was being taken.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. About \$70,000 an acre.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That is not a large amount in a city.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not as much as that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Norfolk, Va.: Dry dock, to complete, \$2,000,000; waterfront improvements, \$500,000; improvements central power plant and distributing systems, \$300,000; tracks, streets, and sewers, \$150,000; galvanizing shop, \$100,000; toward steel and lumber storage (limit of cost, \$850,000), \$400,000; in all, \$3,450,000.

Mr. FESS. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. At this navy yard down in Virginia is there any disturbance by the placing of the Army there? Is there an Army cantonment there?

Mr. PADGETT. The Army has a cantonment there, but it is a number of miles away from the navy yard.

Mr. FESS. How far?

Mr. BRITTEN. At least 8 miles.

Mr. PADGETT. It is a number of miles away. The Army cantonment is down at Newport News, and is about 12 or 15 miles from Norfolk.

Mr. FESS. There was a gentleman here yesterday, and he remarked that the work down at Newport News had been greatly increased because of the Army activities at that place.

Mr. PADGETT. Newport News is 12 or 15 miles from Norfolk, and the Newport News Co. is a private shipbuilding company and not a Government activity, although they do build Government ships there. It is a private corporation.

Mr. FESS. It was suggested to me that we had not acted with very great wisdom in placing so near together the activities of the Navy and the activities of the Army.

Mr. PADGETT. The activities of the Navy, I expect, that he had reference to were not at Norfolk, but at what is known as the naval training base over at Hampton Roads.

Mr. FESS. That is what he had in mind; yes.

Mr. PADGETT. They are about 8 miles apart, on opposite sides of the water.

The Clerk read as follows:

Buildings and grounds, Naval Academy: Extension of Bancroft Hall, to complete, \$1,850,000; and the limit of cost is increased to \$2,850,000; improvements central power plant and distributing systems, \$325,000; general store building, \$100,000; in all, \$2,275,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee how nearly completed are the improvements and central power plant and distributing system. I notice last year we appropriated \$300,000 for improvements, and we carry \$325,000 this year.

Mr. PADGETT. This is for enlargement, really. The power plant was established there a number of years ago, when each Member of Congress had one appointee. Later on the number of appointees was doubled. Later on the appointments were added to and we had three, and now we have five. Instead of having,

as originally, an average attendance of something like 500, they are now expecting this approaching term 1,800, and the succeeding term they are expecting to have 2,200. The power plant and distributing system is for the power and the heat of those buildings, and the gentleman will notice there that we are adding to Bancroft Hall for the accommodation of 600 young men in that one building. This is for the heat and light and general care of that additional building. That is going to cost something like two and three-quarter million dollars. With the expenditure of the \$325,000 it is expected that the central power plant and distributing system will be sufficient for the extension to Bancroft Hall and the other increased facilities there.

Mr. WALSH. That is our necessity at the present time?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. But, of course, if further extensions are made there will be needed further increase in the power plant.

Mr. PADGETT. That might be so. Of course, they have a margin or factor of safety over and above what is actually required at the time, but not a large one.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee if I can. This provides an addition of \$1,850,000 for Bancroft Hall, an increase of the limit of cost to \$2,850,000. Can the gentleman inform the committee how much Bancroft Hall has cost up to date; that is, the entire building?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. Twenty years ago, before I came to Congress, the construction of the new Naval Academy was authorized, and, if I remember correctly, it was \$10,000,000 or \$14,000,000. I see on the floor a former distinguished chairman of this committee. I will here ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] whether he remembers it was \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000.

Mr. FOSS. I think it was in the neighborhood of \$10,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember exactly; it was before I came to Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That was for a number of buildings.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and this was one of the buildings constructed out of that lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman inform the committee who was the architect of Bancroft Hall?

Mr. PADGETT. I expect the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Butler] can tell the gentleman. I am very poor at remembering names. He was a civilian architect.

Mr. BUTLER. I remember it very well. I know all about it. It cost \$14,000,000. Flagg was the name of the architect. He agreed to have it done for \$10,000,000 and it cost \$14,000,000. We asked the House to be patient and wait, and they started in the House a rumor that the North intended to steal the Naval Academy away from the South, and everybody voted for it, and they got the \$14,000,000; and now you have the whole story.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not remember that.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not prevent these things, but I can see them as they pass by. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Apparently it is not the intention to construct separate buildings, but merely keep on enlarging Bancroft Hall. How long is Bancroft Hall at the present time?

Mr. PADGETT. About 800 or 900 feet.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is that all?

Mr. PADGETT. It is four stories high, I believe, and they are adding two wings on the rear, at a cost of two and three-quarter million dollars.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Of course, this undoubtedly is needed, and it is not in the mind of any of us to oppose it; but I do want to say this, which I have thought for many years: The architecture of the Naval Academy is a monstrous failure. The buildings are not adapted in the slightest degree, according to my judgment, to an academy of this character. Bancroft Hall looks like a swell apartment house on Riverside Drive in New York City.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not want to put his judgment up against the judgment of all of these statesmen on the Naval Committee, does he?

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, we are neither builders nor fakes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am reminded at this time of one occasion when I visited Annapolis and had with me a very distinguished military officer from Europe. After we were permitted, with the aid of an old, decrepit soldier, to look at some of the buildings on the outside and others on the inside, we entered the august chamber of Bancroft Hall, and there, standing in the center, was a gentleman dressed and having the appearance of a head page at a showy hotel or a very austere

porter. My friend said to me, "Is not this a naval academy?" I said, "Certainly; is not this a fine building?" "Yes; it is magnificent; but do you have your young men living here?" "Yes; is not this a splendid place for them?" "Yes; it is a nice home for them, a beautiful home, a great pile, but it does not appear to be adapted for a naval academy." Now, that was several years ago, and in conversation with naval officers I have found they are pretty well agreed with my friend's estimate. I wish humbly to suggest, and with the most profound interest, if it is possible to build new buildings at Annapolis instead of continually enlarging Bancroft Hall. I do not wish to make any disparagement by comparison, but no person can visit West Point and then visit Annapolis without a feeling that one is a triumph, and that is West Point, in architecture that is adapted to the needs of that sort of an institution. To my mind West Point presents in appearance, architecture, and adaptation to existing needs the most perfect and splendid institution in America. No person can visit Annapolis and see this great endless pile and feel that it is a kind of building that should be there for this purpose. Is not it possible, instead of keeping enlarging and extending this pile indefinitely and infinitely, to erect other buildings for the same purpose that will be a little more appropriate?

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I would like to have a moment more to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. But we have expended \$14,000,000 in that property, let me say to my friend, and what will we do?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am willing to let the \$14,000,000 stay in this building, but let us not keep extending it until it covers the whole of Maryland. Let us build another building or two that is somewhat better adapted to the needs of the institution. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. That will probably be attended to after this year; as soon as they finish that they will take up the others.

The Clerk read as follows:

The President is authorized to acquire under the authority and provisions of this act all of the remaining portion of Parris Island for the enlargement of the marine recruiting station, Port Royal, S. C.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. How much is intended to be acquired?

Mr. PADGETT. About 3,000 acres.

Mr. WALSH. How much has been already acquired?

Mr. PADGETT. A small amount; I do not know. I should say about 200 acres, or something like that. We have something like seven or eight thousand men there. Nearly every man who goes into the Marine Corps goes through that place as an advanced training point.

Mr. WALSH. There is a lump sum, I assume, somewhere in this act—

Mr. PADGETT. I think it is only about 70 acres.

Mr. WALSH. We have only 70 acres at Parris Island?

Mr. PADGETT. And they need drill-ground extension; and another thing I want to call to the attention of the gentleman and the committee, and that is the conditions there. There are a number of undesirable people there, who have little holdings around there, which is calculated to bring about bootlegging and gambling and other matters that every man can readily see without my mentioning them, and it is very necessary to have an enlargement of the activities of the recruiting station.

Mr. WALSH. Does this take in the entire island?

Mr. PADGETT. It takes in the entire island.

Mr. WALSH. Is this going to be taken for a marine recruiting station?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. How far is it from the mainland?

Mr. PADGETT. It is rather in the river that comes up there, and a great deal of that is marshland.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is a training station.

Mr. WALSH. It does not say so; it says marine recruiting station.

Mr. PADGETT. It is called a recruiting station, but nearly every man of the Marine Corps goes through there for his last training.

Mr. BRITTEN. A course of about 12 weeks. He has his initial training at Parris Island and then goes to Quantico, where they give him the finishing course. It is very important to the Marine Corps that the Parris Island purchase be left in the bill.

Mr. WALSH. I assume that somewhere in the bill there is a lump-sum appropriation to cover these various authorizations for the acquisition of property.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct. This was calculated at \$160,000, not to exceed \$160,000.

Mr. WALSH. For 3,000 acres?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to remind the chairman of the committee there are some very objectionable elements at Parris Island now.

Mr. PADGETT. It should be \$150,000 instead of \$160,000, I find on refreshing my memory.

Mr. WALSH. How much will be required to make this island habitable to live on after these 3,000 acres are acquired?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand the conditions there are healthy now. One of the things is to remove some of the moral conditions that are there.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that under the law which we have heretofore passed that the Secretary of the Navy can not clean up Parris Island?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; he can clean up the island during war, but we are taking care of it now for peace as well as for war. Under the war power we can keep them away, but the people living on the island we can not keep away from there. And there are these little huts scattered all around there consisting of a very undesirable population, one that is pretty hard to handle and deal with.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the department has an option on this land which the \$150,000 will cover?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; there is no option. It is put under the general provision, and the President will take it over and value it and pay for it under that proceeding. The title situation is very complicated. There are some contested claims that would have to be adjudicated and would have to be taken over by the President under these condemnation proceedings.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is the chairman ready to state to the members of the committee that, in his judgment, the purchase of it will not cost to exceed \$150,000?

Mr. PADGETT. That is the information we get. We had a telegram sent to Gen. Cole, who is in command there, and he investigated it, and I saw him personally, and he stated that he thought that would cover it; but, of course, under a condemnation proceeding the gentleman recognizes that there is no way to limit the price. That has to be fixed by judicial proceedings.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Is this land owned largely by these undesirable people in small allotments?

Mr. PADGETT. A good deal of it is.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Is a considerable portion of it owned by one man?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and a good deal of it is swamp land that has nothing on it at all.

Mr. MADDEN. What equipment has the Government on the island now?

Mr. PADGETT. It has a good deal. On the 70 acres that the Government owns they have two main buildings, and they have leases, I think, on some 700 or 800 acres of it for drill grounds, on which they have the equipment necessary for the drilling and training of these men.

Mr. MADDEN. What water surrounds the island?

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman means what river that is?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. Is it navigable?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. It is Port Royal Harbor. At one time it was a naval station. Ships went up there.

Mr. MADDEN. What has to be done with the river now to make it capable of meeting the situation that is required to be met?

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing whatever to the river.

Mr. MADDEN. Any docks to be built?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. MADDEN. Any swamps to be filled?

Mr. PADGETT. They have some swamp land that they mean to fill in for their purposes later on, but not at the present time.

Mr. MADDEN. The present proposed expenditure is to be \$150,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the ultimate expenditure contemplated to be?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of anything beyond what is provided here.

Mr. MADDEN. All the equipment is on the island that is necessary for the training of men now?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. Some is here provided for the training of the additional men.

Mr. MADDEN. How much?

Mr. PADGETT. For 12 additional barracks and 4 lavatories and mess halls, \$6,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Here is a provision for reclaiming swamps. How much is that?

Mr. PADGETT. Thirty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. How much of the marsh land will that reclaim?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know just how much.

Mr. MADDEN. How about the sea wall?

Mr. PADGETT. That is to keep it from running back into the river. The dredging runs behind that.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose before we get through it will cost a million dollars.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no. The gentleman has his sights too high.

Mr. MADDEN. I know that everything we do costs about ten times as much as the gentleman says it will cost.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that item.

Mr. PADGETT. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. WALSH. There are several authorizations for the acquisition of land in very general language, and it seems to me that they are of sufficient importance to be made a subject of special legislation.

Mr. PADGETT. I will tell the gentleman frankly why we did not put the amount there. If the gentleman insists upon it, we will put the amount there, but the committee discussed the question. There are several places where it is authorized to acquire land. If we put the amount specified there, that goes as a sort of notice of the amount that is expected to be expended there; but if we authorize the acquisition of it without specifying in connection with the acquisition any definite amount, there is no notice to those people as to what Congress had set aside specially for that purpose. We have several places here where we have pursued that course, and put the amount, the aggregate, \$680,000, I think, in appropriations for the President to pay for these several tracts that are to be acquired. One is at Newport, R. I., and another is at Lake Denmark.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts withhold his point of order a moment, please?

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will permit me to ask a question, possibly I may withdraw it. It says "the President is authorized to acquire under the provisions of this act." He has the authority here to acquire it by condemnation proceedings and pay over 75 per cent of what it is thought to be?

Mr. PADGETT. Exactly. That is the reason we put it in that form.

Mr. WALSH. That is on page 74.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. The gentleman will see that it reads:

The President is hereby authorized and empowered, within the amounts herein appropriated therefor, to take over immediately for the United States possession of and title to each and all of the parcels of land, including appurtenances and improvements for the acquisition of which authority is herein granted and for which appropriations are herein made. *Provided*, That if said lands and appurtenances and improvements shall be taken over as aforesaid, the United States shall make just compensation therefor, to be determined by the President, and if the amount thereof so determined by the President is unsatisfactory to the person entitled to receive the same, such person shall be paid 75 per cent of the amount so determined by the President and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as added to said 75 per cent will make up such amount as will be just compensation therefor, in the manner provided for by section 24, paragraph 20, section 145, of the Judicial Code: *Provided further*, That upon the taking over of said property by the President as aforesaid the title to all property so taken over shall immediately vest in the United States.

That is the standardized form.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not somewhat unusual to make a blanket of authorization without fixing any limit of cost in the authorization?

Mr. PADGETT. I stated to the gentleman why we left that out.

Mr. WALSH. I know; and I can see the undesirability of including it in some specific instances; but I question whether it has been done heretofore, and whether it is the proper policy to give a blanket power to acquire land without a specific appropriation for the parcel sought to be acquired, and I doubt the wisdom of embarking upon a policy of making separate authorizations and covering them all with a blanket appropriation.

Mr. PADGETT. The limitation of it is contained in the amount of money that is appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH. There is no specific amount appropriated for this particular tract.

Mr. PADGETT. There is an amount appropriated for that and the others, three or four of them, including Lake Denmark.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; \$680,000 is the blanket sum covering all these authorizations?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. If it is insisted upon, and if it is thought wiser, we can add right here the words "not to exceed \$150,000."

Mr. BRITTEN. The committee considered that very carefully, and it was left out principally because we felt that if we specified \$150,000 for this land to be purchased, the Government never in the world would pay less than \$150,000, so that the land owners would hold the Government up and govern themselves accordingly. We took out the \$150,000 and put in a blanket amount for that reason. I believe it is a protection to the Government, although I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that generally it is a bad practice.

Mr. WALSH. It has not been done before.

Mr. PADGETT. The committee considered that.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It has been done with reference to other appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. For the condemnation of land? Does the gentleman from Alabama state that this has ever been done before with a blanket sum?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think that lump sums of money have been placed in the hands of the President to expend for certain purposes, as in this case. He has recently bought a tract of land in the city of Washington out of a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, he bought the Arlington Hotel out of an emergency fund which we gave him of \$100,000,000, without any limitation or specific authorization, because that was appropriated as an emergency fund; but I doubt whether we have ever given the President authority to acquire property under the provisions of an act without fixing some amount of money to be applied to the land desired to be acquired, and I doubt if it is wise to embark upon that policy at the present time and to establish that precedent.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me say, if the gentleman will permit me right there, that the character of construction going on at the Arlington Hotel site is the cheapest of its type that I have ever seen anywhere in the history of all my experience.

Mr. WALSH. Probably that was why it was purchased.

Mr. BRITTEN. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order. On yesterday the Marine Corps was increased 150 per cent, and most of the recruits will go to Parris Island first. If you want to do something for the Marine Corps, withdraw your point of order, because this amendment will go in in the Senate if it is not put in here. It is very highly necessary. The committee considered very thoroughly the gentleman's particular objection to the paragraph, and decided that the interests of the Government would be the better conserved by doing it in the way we have.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the objection of my friend from Illinois is not well taken under the circumstances, for this reason: If this land was all held by one party, undoubtedly fixing the price at \$150,000 would insure the Government paying that. But as I understand the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] this is held by a number of different parties. They can not get together and fix their prices—

Mr. BRITTEN. But they do.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The President will undoubtedly do the best he can, and I think the limit ought to be fixed here.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman from Massachusetts insists on it, I will offer an amendment to limit the appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. With that fact in mind, that the limit is to be fixed by an amendment, and because it is rather hard to resist the appeals and the propositions of the chairman of the committee and the other members in behalf of the Marine Corps, and the service which they represent and the rights which they so ably safeguard, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me state for the benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts that if the House puts in a limitation of \$1 it will not control the price, and an appropriation of \$1,000,000 will not do it. Do you remember how this House, after two days discussion, limited the price of Jamestown to \$1,200,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Under condemnation, of course, we can not limit the price.

Mr. BUTLER. Did we not provide an appropriation of \$1,200,000 for Jamestown, and did they not pay over \$1,400,000, under the method employed by the present administration for the purpose of condemning land?

Mr. WALSH. That is because we gave them authority to condemn it and to pay 75 per cent and let them go into court for the rest.

Mr. BUTLER. But you appoint commissioners, and the commissioners fix the price, and the Government then pays the price so fixed.

Mr. WALSH. I trust the gentleman is not blaming me.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course I am not blaming the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says "You appoint the commissioners." Whom does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not mean that the gentleman from Massachusetts appoints the commissioners. I mean that when that method is adopted commissioners are appointed, and they fix the price, and then the Government may and usually does pay that price.

Mr. PADGETT. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire that I offer an amendment? If so, I am going to keep perfect good faith with him.

Mr. WALSH. I think the amendment ought to be offered.

Mr. PADGETT. All right. I will ask to add at the end of line 8, page 46, the words "and the sum of \$150,000 is hereby appropriated for this purpose."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, at the end of line 8, add the words: "And the sum of \$150,000 is hereby appropriated for this purpose."

Mr. PADGETT. Or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment as read will be modified by adding the words stated by the gentleman from Tennessee. Without objection, the amendment as modified is agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The Chair did not put the negative side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair said "Without objection, the amendment as modified is agreed to," and there was no objection.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct the spelling of a word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 7, correct the spelling of the word "Paris" so as to read "Parris."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course, there are not two r's in Paris.

Mr. PADGETT. There may be when it is the name of a man. This is the name of the owner, and he spells it Parris, and it is known in the local history as Parris Island.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, the question came up a few moments ago as to the cost of the reconstruction of the Naval Academy, and I sent for the Navy Yearbook. This work of reconstruction was begun under my predecessor, Hon. Charles A. Boutelle, of Maine, who was chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. The limit of cost fixed in the act of June 7, 1900, was \$8,000,000, and that was increased in the act of July 1, 1902, to \$10,000,000 for the reconstruction of the Naval Academy. I may say that for myself I was not in sympathy with the style of architecture for that institution which was decided upon. I was favorable to the rebuilding of the Naval Academy in brick and stone with a colonial style of architecture.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, let me add this, that it is commonly understood that the original contract, with the extensions and improvements that have been made up to the last six or eight years, have cost the Government between \$13,000,000 and \$14,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 46, line 4, I desire to have the spelling of the word "shrubby" corrected. An "r" was left out.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling of the word.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Charleston, S. C.: For the dredging of the basin at the navy yard and the dredging of a channel from the navy yard to deep water beyond the jetties of a depth of 40 mean low tide and a width of 1,000 feet to provide a sufficient depth of water for proper use of the large dry dock herein authorized (limit of cost \$5,000,000), \$1,000,000, and for the construction of a large dry dock (limit of cost \$4,000,000), \$1,150,000; dredging, to continue, \$25,000; railroad system extension, \$15,000; toward water-front improvements, \$200,000; boat storage, \$10,000; in all, \$2,400,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a preferential matter to an amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that portion of the paragraph from the begin-

ning down to the comma after the figures "\$1,000,000," in line 15.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I was just about to move to strike that out. The gentleman can make the point of order and it will be the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee concedes the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and it is stricken from the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was somewhat at a loss as to how this provision struck out got in this paragraph, as it evidently comes under the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. It was all gone over at the time that bill was under consideration. A moment ago my friend from Ohio was speaking of the fact that when we had small appropriations under consideration there was apt to be a considerable discussion and a very large attendance, a fact to which I have called attention myself on previous occasions. I do not know whether my friend was present at the time this provision for Charleston Harbor was gone over when the rivers and harbors appropriation bill was under consideration. If he was, he noted the attendance in the House at that time. Far be it from me to intimate that there was any combination between the Members from New York who wanted to have New York Harbor deepened and the Members from the Southern States who wanted to have the channel at Charleston deepened and extended and those that wanted also to have the harbor at Key West extended, but for some reason, by a most remarkable coincidence, there was at that time a large and full attendance of the gentlemen from those sections, both North and South, and also by a further remarkable coincidence they hung together very strongly when this matter came up for a vote on the passage of the amendments.

Mr. FOSS. And they are here now?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Some of them are here now. Not many, because we have reached a stage where they have this provision strongly entrenched in the rivers and harbors appropriation bill. I hope the body at the other end of the Capitol will do something with it, for, although it seems to be abandoned for the present, I think it will be necessary to keep watch upon it. This provision ought not to be in any bill, in this or any other, because it is not a war measure.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. Did the gentleman express the hope that the Senate would do something with it or to it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I accept the gentleman's amendment—something to it. That is what ought to be done, in my opinion. At a time like this, when we are at war, it seems to me we ought not to have any ground for suspicion that there are any combinations for the purpose of logrolling or ship getting or harbor deepening. The time for that ought to have passed long ago. If we are ever to do away with it, we ought to do away with it now, in this extremity of war, when all other considerations ought to be dropped and local matters entirely forgotten.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I understood the point of order was made down to and including the figures "\$1,000,000" in line 15, leaving the word "and" in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the way the Chair understands it.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, I move to strike out the word "and" and also the comma before that word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 15, strike out the comma and the word "and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, also the word "for" ought to be spelled with a capital letter, and I ask that the Clerk be authorized to make that change.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, also I desire to correct the total. In line 19, page 46, I move to strike out the figures "\$2,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,400,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 19, strike out the figures "\$2,400,000" and insert "\$1,400,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee whether the improvements authorized in this paragraph were included within the recommendations of any one of the reports of the Helm Commission?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; the Helm Commission recommended that the yard should be made a first-class yard, and they stated that there were various improvements needed there, and suggested that the details of them be worked out by the offices in the proper bureaus, but these are not submitted in any part of the Helm Board report. They come as the recommendations of the department, independent of the Helm Board.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman further state when these improvements are expected to be completed and the yard to be in condition to be used?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, the yard is being used now, very largely and very actively, and this is just as it is at various other yards where we are making improvements for water-front, boat storage, railroad systems, extensions, and things of that kind. The gentleman will notice just below in the bill there is the Key West station improvement, \$25,000, and the naval station at New Orleans, for a floating crane and the improvements in the central power plant and distributing system, water-front improvements, etc. All those matters are recommendations that come from the department, customarily, from year to year, as the developments are needed, just as we had up a few moments ago in respect to the power plant at Annapolis. These are not parts of the Helm Board report. The committee has not taken up for consideration the Helm Board report, because they have not completed their work.

Mr. ELSTON. That is what I wanted to get at.

Mr. PADGETT. And the department has not taken up consideration of the Helm Board report.

Mr. ELSTON. What I want to get at from the chairman is that the improvements authorized in this paragraph are not in contravention of the statement made by the Secretary of the Navy and intimations made to me by the chairman of this committee that none of the recommendations of the Helm Commission covering either the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific coasts are to be taken up for legislation during the present session.

Mr. PADGETT. Not at all, sir. These are the ones that come customarily in the class and character and type of improvements along the line of natural development of the yard and would have been made if there had never been a Helm Board report or if there had never been a Helm Board created, and it has nothing to do and is not dependent upon and is not brought in because of the Helm Board report.

Mr. ELSTON. Can the gentleman state, if he knows, when it is expected to take up any of the projects covered by any of the reports of the Helm Commission?

Mr. PADGETT. Not this session of Congress; and whether they will next session is a matter that I do not care to prophesy about so far in advance. The Helm Board has not yet completed its investigation. My idea is that the Helm Board recommendations, as recommendations of that board, will not be taken up until after the conclusion of this war.

Mr. ELSTON. The Helm Commission reported that the present navy-yard facilities on the Pacific coast should be trebled. They show that the Pacific coast yards have only one-fourth the capacity of the Atlantic coast yards. If major fleet operations should occur on the Pacific coast the present yards could take care of only one-fourth of the necessary requirement for berthing and dry docks and for repair and supply. Does not the gentleman believe that a large project, like the proposed naval base on San Francisco Bay, involving at least six years for completion, should be commenced soon?

Mr. PADGETT. That might be over there and that might come through the department as departmental recommendations independent of the Helm report or a report.

Mr. ELSTON. Using the Helm report as a basis for details or for advisory purposes?

Mr. PADGETT. For advisory purposes; yes, sir.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs a question or two. Is this the first time this item has been ever carried with regard to the dry dock at Charleston, S. C.?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. In the bill two years ago, I believe it was, or last year, there was an amendment inserted by the Senate to enlarge the existing dock that is there and make it a thousand feet long. The conferees on the part of the House would not stand for that, because that would not have been a usable dock; the depth was not sufficient. That dock is about 30 or 31 feet over the sills. This one will be 42 feet over the sills. This is the first time a dock of this kind has been pro-

posed there, but there is an amendment in the former bill to lengthen the dock and make it a thousand feet, but not to deepen it, and it would not have been usable for the purpose for which it was intended.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This is intended to accompany the provision passed in the river and harbor bill the other day?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is there any limit on the cost of this dock?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; \$4,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How is that limit provided; simply provided by the brackets here?

Mr. PADGETT. It is provided like it is always provided; like every limit of cost that is inserted in the naval bill or the other bill, it says the limit of cost shall be \$4,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I ask the gentleman, frankly, does that mean anything at all?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; it means they can not exceed it without authority of Congress. They have to come to Congress to exceed it.

Mr. BUTLER. But they have often come?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. And we have never denied them?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In this case they will come?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. We authorized two similar docks, one at Philadelphia and one at Norfolk, and they are being built under contract and within the limit of three and a half million dollars. This is \$500,000 more than the limit of cost at Philadelphia or at Norfolk. Those two are being built under the limit of cost, and I am not prepared to say that this one will exceed the \$4,000,000 provided here; but the gentleman knows, as well as anybody knows, what the state of public sentiment is about wages, about the labor situation, the material situation, and so forth.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Well, I may not remember correctly, but I do not think I ever remember an original proposition involving such a large amount as this with the limit of cost being fixed merely by brackets.

Mr. PADGETT. Always fixed that way.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And by no other provision.

Mr. PADGETT. We fixed it exactly as we did in reference to Norfolk, and just exactly that way for Philadelphia, and just exactly that way for Pearl Harbor.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As an original proposition?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; as an original proposition.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How large a ship is it expected the dock will care for?

Mr. PADGETT. Any ship that will go through the Panama Canal.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not arise to seek information about any of the provisions of this bill, but only for the purpose of expressing my earnest hope that we will be able to pass this important and needed legislation before we adjourn to-day. I was greatly impressed this morning by the receipt of a postal card containing a statement made by the late Ambassador Joseph H. Choate, one of the most eminent lawyers in the United States, three days before he died, a parting appeal to us all, containing these words, "For God's sake, hurry up!" I have not sought to consume any of the valuable time of this House in a discussion of the provisions of the pending bill, but I wish now to earnestly appeal to every Member on both sides of the House to bear in mind the far-reaching importance of immediate and favorable action upon every one of these war measures. Such a course upon our part will have a splendid effect throughout America, and it will reach beyond the seas. If there ever was a time since the declaration of war when all the American people, led by the example of their chosen Representatives in Congress, should hurry, should speed up, that time is now of all times.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to ask my friend whether, in view of the record of this Congress at the extra session and so far at this session in the granting of money and power in every case where it was asked, that message had not been more properly sent to another branch of this Government rather than to the legislative branch?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not here to criticize another branch of Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I said another than the legislative branch.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will not, during the period of the war, in a public manner seek to embarrass or to criticize the war admin-

istration while our boys are on the battle line fighting the Kaiser. [Applause.]

If I have a complaint from any constituent, I take it to the head of the proper department and submit it; and I have never failed to have the complaint promptly and satisfactorily attended to. Even the appearance of a division in sentiment in or out of Congress deserves criticism, and general faultfinding will not strengthen the American cause, and will not aid us either at home or abroad. It will not encourage our boys in France, but will give comfort to the enemy.

I believe it is the duty of every Senator and every Member of the House of Representatives to first take his grievances or complaints to the proper department of the Government and insist upon a remedy, a correction, or a satisfactory explanation first before there shall be any public criticism. [Applause.]

If the present administration were Republican and a President of that political faith Commander in Chief and both branches of Congress in sympathy with him, I know as a Republican that I would condemn a criticism here before the complaints were submitted to the heads of the departments for explanation or correction. I believe this the correct and proper course to pursue when the country is at war fighting for its very existence, for its life.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. My friend is thoroughly aware of the fact that this is an appropriation for the year beginning the 30th of next June and ending one year from that time, and therefore I am at a loss to understand the application of the gentleman's remarks to this bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are many, many items within the covers of this bill that are made immediately available, calling for the expenditure of thousands and millions of dollars.

Mr. WALSH. Only as deficiency items.

Mr. AUSTIN. They are made immediately available. The money is needed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an extension of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. In this bill there are numerous provisions requiring the immediate use of money, and the closing paragraph says, "All appropriations contained in this act are hereby made immediately available." The members of the Naval Committee, who have the absolute confidence and respect of every Member of this House, have brought in a unanimous report, and there is not to-day a better nor a more efficient administration in this Government than that of the Navy Department. The highest type of men are directing its affairs, and up to this good hour no man here or elsewhere has dared, during this war, to criticize the administration of the Navy Department. The officials of that department have asked for these sums of money to be made immediately available to carry forward the great work of the Navy to achieve victory. Let us speed up and hasten action. Let us do it to-day, and not carry this important bill over another week to permit an unnecessary debate to continue here, when every particle of the information desired can be obtained personally from the members of the Naval Committee or from reading the printed report or the exhaustive hearings.

Do we not believe in the honor, the ability, the fidelity, and the loyalty of the members of the Naval Committee? Have they ever done anything to forfeit our high opinion and our complete confidence in them? They know the great burden of responsibility upon them is equal almost to that placed upon the membership of the Committee on Military Affairs; and those of us not upon this committee, charged with the duty of examining and passing upon these numerous items can trust them, and our trust will not be abused or betrayed.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Would my friend be willing to suspend the rules and pass the bill without reading? If the committee is to give all the information without anyone asking questions here on the floor of the House, why not suspend the rules and pass the bill at once?

Mr. AUSTIN. If the Navy Department and this great committee should say that the imperative interests of America demanded such a course, I would cheerfully do it.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman differs from most of the Members of the House, who feel responsibility for this legislation.

Mr. AUSTIN. We ask thousands of questions, we offer many amendments, valuable time is consumed, and never a change of a line in the bill, not the dotting of an "i" nor the crossing of a "t."

Mr. KEATING. We put two "r's" in Parris.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman recall that the bill was not discussed at all under general debate? We began it yesterday, and have gone pretty nearly two-thirds of the way through it. I do not think I have heard a single word of discussion on the floor that was not pertinent to the items of the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; and nothing has been accomplished except to delay the passage of the bill. It was a fortunate thing that we dispensed with the general discussion, but we have practically had the general debate under the five-minute rule. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I move to strike out the paragraph as it now stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to strike out the paragraph, and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect that my motion will prevail, but I want the record made, and if no one else feels inclined to support it, I am going to vote for it.

When this same matter was up the other day, while the House was considering the rivers and harbors bill, quite a full discussion was had of the merits of this proposition. It is not necessary to rehash the matter again, especially after the very bitter arraignment of the membership of the House to which we have just listened. In that connection I am fully justified in saying—for the facts bear out the statement—that the House of Representatives will pass this bill appropriating more money in the same length of time than any legislative body has ever appropriated on a similar proposition before in the history of the world. [Applause.] I do not believe this committee merits quite the castigation to which it has just listened. But I want to refer to this just for a moment, notwithstanding the words of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN]. I can not find out that this proposed improvement has any possible bearing on the war program. The earliest date to which we can look for the completion of the project so that it may be used at all is 30 months, and very likely the time will be very much greater than that. If the war is not over in 30 months, it will hardly ever end. It can not be justified on the ground that this is a war emergency. There is absolutely nothing on earth to justify it.

In that connection I want to call attention to the letter that was sent here and read to the House, which said that this project would not be completed within 30 months, and ended by saying that it is a war emergency and therefore ought to be passed. When advice comes to us in that language and in that contradictory fashion our faith in the sources of that advice is very apt to be somewhat shaken. I believe this is a proposition that never ought to have been considered in the river and harbor bill and never ought to be considered here now. If this proposition has merit it should be taken up and considered in connection with the general improvements to be provided for when the House acts on the various items in the report of the Helm committee.

I make no claim to any great knowledge of naval affairs, but I have had opportunity to journey somewhat over the world and I have conversed many times with the leading thinkers in our Navy, and I have never yet found one—I have talked with several on the subject—whose judgment approved this scheme. They do say that an important naval base should be completed in the West Indies. Then, if we are going to build a naval base anywhere, why should we not take up the proposition of building one there? They tell me that the greatest need of the American Navy, outside of the immediate exigencies of this war, is the construction of a great naval base at Guam. I am surprised that the great Naval Committee of this House has never taken up the proposition of the improvement at Guam as an item in the great naval program; but that has never been done. Nor have they taken up the proposition of building a great naval base in the West Indies. The only thing that has been brought up here is this scheme for first digging a river into a part of South Carolina and then at the end of it constructing a great dry dock and a base for certain naval purposes. Frankly, that does not commend itself to my judgment, nor does it commend itself strongly to my enthusiasm for the naval program. But as I said in the beginning, the game is all but won, and there is no doubt as to which is the winning side.

Several years ago, when I had an opportunity personally to see this situation there, I was amazed to think that it had ever been started. But it has been started, and has progressed to a point where now it is to be enormously enlarged. But for my own satisfaction I want the opportunity of making the motion to strike this out and to vote for that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is this motion?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a motion to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice, in line 18, page 46, there is proposed an appropriation of \$200,000 toward—I call attention to the word "toward"—water-front improvements. How far toward these improvements would \$200,000 go?

Mr. PADGETT. My recollection is that it is estimated that it would take more than \$1,000,000.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the nature of the improvement?

Mr. PADGETT. It is a sea wall—holding walls and berthing walls.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the question asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] moves me to say this: The item is passed. It is going to stay in the bill. I make the prediction that we have begun at this point a program which will cost this Government \$25,000,000 before it is completed. Now, mark my words. The gentleman just now developed \$1,000,000, and it is not a war item. The history of the construction of dry docks in the United States shows they require from five to seven years in which to complete them. This is not in any sense whatever a war measure. It has nothing to do with the war. I did not even vote against it myself, but I want Congress and the country to understand what it is doing.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am astonished that, after listening to the admonition of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], who is himself a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, should have arisen here and questioned the wisdom of so much as a single provision of the bill. It is deeply to be regretted that the eminent patriot and lecturer from Tennessee failed to convince the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] that the Committee on Naval Affairs is infallible and entitled to bring in a bill which includes a multitude of items and appropriates almost one and one-half billions of dollars and to have it passed without a question. Mr. Chairman, I never have heard—and this I say with entire respect for my friend from Tennessee—I never in debate here have heard a more utterly ridiculous, indefensible proposition advanced by any man, no matter what his condition [laughter], than was the proposition of the gentleman from Tennessee, who, pointing his finger at you and me, demanded not only that we pass this bill carrying this vast sum, but also that we pass it without stopping to ask any question as to any item.

The proposition is nothing short of amazing. Can we honestly, under our oaths, thus surrender our votes to committee dictation when we legislate on great subjects for the people of the United States? No. We take oath to do our duty as we see it, not as any committee may see it. I have great respect for the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs; but any man who so absolutely surrenders to a committee that he is willing, without having a question asked, to vote a billion and a half of taxes upon the people of the United States does, in my judgment, forget his oath and his duty to his constituents and the country; for I have seen committees make serious mistakes. I have seen great committees strongly recommend important bills which, after earnest, thorough debate, were defeated, and I have seen subsequent events vindicate the judgment of the House in repudiating the judgment of the committee.

But the gentleman from Tennessee insists, in effect, that this tremendous sum should be voted without a word of inquiry. What sort of a proposition is this which he makes? Why, only two pages further on in this bill is a matter that ought to be very thoroughly debated and defeated. Look on page 48. It occupies the entire page. It is a proposition to give to the Secretary of the Navy complete authority to permit an unnamed railroad company to build a railroad into this city and to have its terminus at an unmentioned place anywhere in Washington or the District that he or the unnamed railroad company may decide to locate it. Did the gentleman from Tennessee know about that? Did he purposely reserve his admonition, his eloquence, until just before we reach that proposition, and then say rush this bill through without inquiring further about it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, let us make some progress. I want simply to say that the committee is not courting or inviting encomium, neither is it asking to avoid criticisms. Let us get ahead with the bill. That is all the committee is asking.

Mr. LONGWORTH. "For God's sake, hurry up!"

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to get through with the bill and go after a couple of Huns to-morrow or next day. Nobody here wants to be shot.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] is uneasy for fear I may forget my oath of office. I want to make this public acknowledgment that the only time since I have been a Member of this House, in 10 years, that I forgot my country's interests was when I followed him on the McLemore resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, that is going to open a wide discussion and may involve some of the rest of us. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; many of us.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] led many of us on this side into a trap.

Mr. BUTLER. Why does the gentleman follow him or any one else? I do not follow anybody.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was led into a trap by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], and I shall never follow him again, or anybody.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. PADGETT. Let us read.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I wish it were the regular order to reply to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that debate on this paragraph has long since expired.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, in order to expedite the passage of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Proving Ground, Indianhead, Md.: Improvements to powder factory, \$140,000; pyro storage, \$20,000; in all, \$160,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike from the bill without reading the provision on page 48.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman please state why he does that?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that other arrangements have been made to build the railroad. I understand the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. is going to build a road on its own account down there.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the railroad proposition.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to strike from the bill, without reading it, all of page 48. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval magazine, Fort Mifflin, Pa.: The President is authorized to acquire under the authority and provisions of this act additional land for increasing ordnance facilities in the vicinity of the naval magazine, Fort Mifflin, Pa.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the same thing applies here. The estimate of that is \$360,000, and if the gentleman wants I will insert that by amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his point of order, and the gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. After the end of the paragraph insert "and for this purpose \$360,000 is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Did the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] to strike out include all of the paragraph on page 48?

The CHAIRMAN. The entire page.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is the one to which I called attention.

Mr. PADGETT. That is it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 5, after the word "Pennsylvania," insert the following: "and for this purpose \$360,000 is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, just a question. What is proposed to be done?

Mr. PADGETT. It is to acquire land there for the storage of high explosives, to enlarge the magazine. We are getting a tremendous amount of powder and high explosives on hand, and we have to have somewhere to store them, and when the war is over they will be taken off in large quantities from the ships in commerce and also from our fighting ships, and we have not any place to store them; and this is for the purpose of enlarging the magazine at Fort Mifflin.

Mr. CANNON. Well, the gentleman has investigated it and he thinks that the appropriation ought to be made. Of course we now are constructing under other bills storage facilities in New York?

Mr. PADGETT. They are for merchandise, for food, clothing, and so forth.

Mr. CANNON. And also at Philadelphia.

Mr. PADGETT. We are providing for acquiring additional land at Philadelphia, next to Fort Mifflin, which comes right next down below there. We want land there. I have a statement here that is strictly confidential, because gentlemen can see the necessity of not publishing how much we have stored at different places.

Mr. CANNON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. PADGETT. I would be willing to show it to any Member of the House as a confidential statement showing the enormous amount stored and being manufactured at a greater speed than ever before.

Mr. CANNON. Many bills have carried similar appropriations?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; it is quite common.

Mr. CANNON. I think perhaps in the sundry civil bill, and certainly in two deficiency bills, we carried very large amounts for storage.

Mr. PADGETT. Not for the Navy, I think.

Mr. CANNON. Probably the gentleman is correct, but for the Army.

Mr. PADGETT. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Well, the gentleman knows more about it than I do. I merely asked for information.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee two or three questions?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. He will recall this is one of the items in the bill that gave the Committee on Naval Affairs a good deal of concern lest we might be held up for exorbitant and extravagant prices. Before this land shall be acquired by the Government will the gentleman ask the authorities in the Navy Department to examine with care the eastern end of that island, which is known as League Island, to see whether it will be possible to put these magazines at that end of the island and avoid being held up, which I believe may be the fate of the Government.

Mr. PADGETT. I have a statement of the Secretary of the Navy in relation to that, and I have a letter here from him in which he states that it would not do, that it would not be possible to store the high explosives in large quantities upon the navy yard where we have millions and millions invested in manufacture, and with six, eight, or ten thousand men working every day and night in the year.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, that is all very handsome and very pretty as the Secretary of the Navy sends it, but I know something about this. If these magazines can be located at the eastern end of the island, they will be further away from humanity than where it is proposed to locate them, which is just across the Schuylkill River, a short distance from the shops of the League Island Navy Yard, while the other end of the tract must be a mile or a mile and a half away. I propose to walk over the island and propose to have that measured. I intend to know whether or not that is the proper place to put these magazines. It may put the naval officers to a little more trouble in reference to hauling, but I intend to see. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee; it is absolutely necessary to have some place where those high explosives can be stored and not endanger every life in the city of Philadelphia, as I contend it would from the location as I understand it. I may change my mind about it after I walk over it in a few days, but from all I can see we will have less danger from explosions, less danger to human life, by putting these magazines at the other end of the island.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. I have no desire to enter into any controversy with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], but his re-

marks lead me to observe that if he is the character of statesman that he would have us believe, from the argument that he has advanced here he is lacking in that degree of courage and sound judgment which I, for one, heretofore had attributed to him, because I have never seen anything in his career here in the House—and it has been somewhat long, and during all that time it has been honorable—to indicate that he stood in fear of postal cards.

However much we might agree with the statement expressed upon the postal cards, I doubt if it would be wise for Congress to discontinue its labors and return to our homes and allow the Government to be conducted by postal-card edicts, sent out by people who utterly lack intelligent information or intimate knowledge upon the tremendous problems that are being legislated upon here in this Congress by reason of the war emergency.

It is easy to adopt or reiterate a phrase that was uttered some 11 or 12 months ago, the dying words of a former distinguished ambassador, the Hon. Joseph H. Choate, and to seek to apply it to the conditions that exist to-day. But let me direct the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee and the attention of the writers of those cards to the fact that since those words were uttered May 11, 1917, this Congress has hurried up, it has speeded up, and we have met every test, and there is nobody among those who are writing these messages who can point out a single project or proposition of legislation that is at the present time held up by Congress or being purposely delayed, or that is crippling the arm of this Government in the prosecution of this great war.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WALSH. I yield for a question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does not the gentleman know, and every Member of the House know, that it will not make a particle of difference whether this bill is passed to-day or passed some time next week, so far as any operations of the Government are concerned?

Mr. WALSH. I think that is true, although there may be one or two appropriations which are to be made immediately available, which the department may require in the near future. But a day or two, I assure the gentleman, would make no great difference.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is not any of them that has not money now.

Mr. WALSH. I think so. Another thing, Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague from Tennessee has become somewhat famous, if I may use the term, for looking with favor upon any measure carrying an appropriation, and the larger the appropriation the greater is his glee in voting for it. And so here we have a bill of \$1,350,000,000 or more, which he seeks to jam through without question or discussion, because of his confidence in the Committee on Naval Affairs. If that be the standard to be followed, where would the draft law have been when it was taken up?

I deny that I sought to hinder or delay. I have asked questions, as have others, including members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, because I believe I have the right to know, before voting on these projects, as has every Member of the House. Fortunately I know I am not responsible to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for my acts here upon the floor, nor need I answer to the great constituency which he represents so well and faithfully. I have listened to him in the past, and I think he is a master at bestowing verbal tributes and encomiums upon committees and chairmen for the faithful performance of their work, and I have joined him heretofore, and I join him now, in thinking that this great committee deserves praise for its work.

But neither the chairman of the committee nor any member of the committee, so far as I have been able to ascertain, has intimated or asked that Members sit silent and allow this bill to be read through from the first to the last line without asking questions or seeking information or debating the merits of proposed changes in legislation. I have made points of order against legislation upon this bill because it is contrary to the rules of the House, and in several, if not all, instances, upon the urgency being explained, upon information being given. I have withdrawn those points of order; and I have no apology to make to my colleagues nor to the writers of these postal cards from here and you throughout the country for anything that I have said or done or failed to say or do upon this measure, nor do I believe such a course is disloyal. I believe the country will be better satisfied if we see to it that this legislation is carefully considered and passed than it would be if we see to it that it is carelessly and hurriedly passed, because we have all seen very often the result of hurried legislation. It requires, later on,

remedial legislation, and only results in protracting the session sometimes which it is sought to shorten.

I feel that mayhap some of the desires of some gentlemen to hurry this session and adjourn may be inspired by the fact that in the weeks to come, or in the not very far distant future, there is to be an election or a primary and that possibly some campaigning may be required. I do not think that emergency, even together with the postal cards, ought to frighten us into haste and ill-considered legislation, and I challenge the assertion that Congress is deserving of these contemptuous appeals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Puget Sound, Wash.: Improvements, central power plant and distributing systems, \$200,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the same as the other. The amount is \$18,000. I will offer an amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval magazine, Lake Denmark, N. J.: The President is authorized to acquire under the authority and provisions of this act additional land for increasing ordnance facilities in the vicinity of the naval magazine, Lake Denmark, N. J.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee proposes an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. PADGETT. Page 49, at the end of line 14, add "and for this purpose there is appropriated \$18,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 49, line 14, after the words "New Jersey," insert the following: "and for this purpose \$18,000 is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Torpedo station, Newport, R. I., buildings: Boathouse and diving school, \$100,000; emergency torpedo repair shop, \$100,000; extension of industrial roads, \$20,000; extension of sea wall, \$5,000; rebuilding carpenter shop, \$25,000; in all, \$250,000.

The President is authorized to acquire under the authority and provisions of this act additional land for increasing ordnance facilities in the vicinity of the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that—the same point.

Mr. BUTLER. Is that the island item?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; the island at Newport.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that part of this appropriation is for a diving school. Does that mean anything more than a swimming pool?

Mr. PADGETT. It is where the deep-sea divers are educated. We had some divers who went from there who broke the world's record in raising the F-boat in Pearl Harbor.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. With diving apparatus?

Mr. PADGETT. With diving apparatus; and this is for the training of the divers.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 49, line 23, after the words "Rhode Island," insert the following: "And for this purpose \$100,000 is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval training station (Illinois) buildings: Dredging harbor, \$35,000.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer an amendment after line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 50, line 18, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"The President is authorized to acquire, under the authority and provisions of this act, additional land for the enlargement of the naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.; and for this purpose \$887,500 is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the language "is authorized to acquire, under the authority and provisions of this act," appears several times in this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; there is a general authority given in a paragraph on page 74.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is what I wished to ask about.

Mr. PADGETT. It is to standardize language used in a number of bills that Congress has passed, authorizing the President to take over the title and the possession, to place a value upon the property and pay 75 per cent, or pay all of it, if they are satisfied with that price.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. This amendment calls for \$887,000 to acquire land at the Great Lakes training station near Chicago?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman inform me whether this land is situated south or north of the Great Lakes station, and what the acreage of the same is, and whether a price has been agreed upon, and by whom?

Mr. PADGETT. No price has been agreed upon. It is to be taken over by the President under the authority of condemnation given him.

Mr. SABATH. How has the price of \$880,000 been fixed on this land?

Mr. PADGETT. That is the estimate that has been put upon it as to the value of the land.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman inform me by whom the estimate has been made?

Mr. PADGETT. By the officer in charge at the Great Lakes station and by inquiry and investigation at the department. They say that will cover it. I think there are something like 700 or 800 acres.

Mr. BRITTEN. There are 709½ acres.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman a statement prepared showing the different prices that have been recommended?

Mr. PADGETT. I have a plat here that shows the acreage.

Mr. SABATH. Does it show the prices recommended for the various parcels of the property?

Mr. PADGETT. I have a plat here that shows the acreage and the estimated cost of each parcel.

Mr. BRITTEN. The plat very clearly shows the number of acres of the various parcels. It designates the owners and also shows the estimated prices at which these various pieces can be had. It indicates Foss Park, named after the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], who was formerly chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

This park, owned by the city of North Chicago, is to be contributed to the Navy for its use indefinitely for a training station. I will say to my colleague [Mr. SABATH] that all of the land on which the present semipermanent buildings are located is to be purchased under this \$887,000 appropriation, at prices varying from a little less than \$1,000 an acre to a little less than \$2,000 an acre, depending upon the location of the land, its proximity to Lake Michigan and the Bluff.

Mr. SABATH. I desire this information because I have been informed that certain prices for some of these parcels have been agreed upon that have been in excess of the actual value of the property.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand from the Secretary that no prices have been agreed upon.

Mr. SABATH. I am willing to concede that the Secretary of the Navy and the Navy Department have been at all times very careful in expending any money which we have appropriated. Nevertheless this matter coming as it did come to me, I thought it my duty to secure all the information that I possibly could, so that I can intelligently answer the inquiries that have been made of me.

If the gentleman has the statement here, and also the plat, the chances are that it will in a great measure aid me in satisfying some of these people.

Mr. PADGETT. I will be very glad to give the gentleman one of these plats. I have several of them. I will give the gentleman a blue print showing the land, the prices, and the acreage in the different parcels.

Mr. BRITTEN. And the owners.

Mr. SABATH. The owners, and the prices recommended so far?

Mr. PADGETT. The prices estimated.

Mr. SABATH. This appropriation will not authorize the immediate purchase at the prices estimated on this plat?

Mr. PADGETT. It does not fix any prices. It authorizes the President to take over the land. Congress has no authority to fix the price. The owners have the right to go into court if they are dissatisfied with the prices fixed by the President.

Mr. SABATH. That is what I desire to know, whether they are going to take the land without condemnation, notwithstanding the fact that it should be ascertained that the prices submitted were altogether too high.

Mr. PADGETT. The President is given the power to fix the price himself, and if it is agreeable to them and they take it, he pays for it in full.

Mr. SABATH. Of course, the gentleman realizes that the President himself can not look after the values, but that somebody else does.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, he does it through a commission or a board, of course; but he must approve the finding of that commission.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the bill, on page 19, carries an item of \$725,000 for this Great Lakes training station.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is for the maintenance of the present station.

Mr. PADGETT. That is for the training—the personnel.

Mr. FESS. This amount is for the increase?

Mr. BRITTEN. For the purchase of land now being used for training purposes?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Does this mean that the Great Lakes station is going to increase largely in the personnel later on?

Mr. PADGETT. They have between 25,000 and 30,000 there now. They have already turned out and sent into the service more than 30,000 men since the war began, and we are using these grounds now under a permissive license or a nominal lease. We have erected many millions of dollars' worth of buildings on the lands, and they need them. It is a station for the great Central West, where all of that section of the country send their men, and it is recommended that instead of scrapping the buildings and things when we need the ground that we go ahead and buy now and preserve the three or four million dollars that we have already expended.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is a fact that some seven or eight million dollars has already been expended on the land this appropriation is intended to purchase.

Mr. SABATH. I understand that a great deal of work has been done there and that a great deal of good has been accomplished, and that a wonderful amount of work is being done now, and that this land is absolutely necessary. What I am interested in is that the price should be reasonable and that we should pay no more for the land than it is actually worth.

Mr. PADGETT. That will be safeguarded as far as possible to safeguard it under the Constitution.

Mr. SABATH. I have the utmost confidence in the gentleman who has charge and in a great majority of the men under him. Nevertheless, I want to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of land herein authorized to be acquired by the President for the use of the Navy and Marine Corps and not herein specifically appropriated for, \$628,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph, because we have already carried those appropriations under various items.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, strike out all of lines 1, 2, and 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, at this time I ask unanimous consent to change the totals, and I will hand the correct amount to the Clerk when we ascertain it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to change the total when the chairman has determined the amount it should be. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: For tolls and ferriages; care, transportation, and burial of the dead, including officers and enlisted men who die within the United States; purchase of books and stationery, binding of medical records, unbound books, and pamphlets; hygienic and sanitary investigation and illustration; sanitary and

hygienic instruction; purchase and repairs of nonpassenger-carrying wagons, automobile ambulances, and harness; purchase of and feed for horses and cows; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of two passenger-carrying motor vehicles for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., and of one motor-propelled vehicle for official use only for the medical officer on out-patient medical service at the Naval Academy, and of a motor omnibus for the transportation of convalescent patients and attendants at the Naval Hospital at Las Animas, Colo., to be used only for official purposes; trees, plants, care of grounds, garden tools, and seeds; incidental articles for the Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington, naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks; washing for medical department at Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington, naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks, dispensaries at navy yards and naval stations, and ships; and for minor repairs on buildings and grounds of the United States Naval Medical School and naval medical supply depots; rent of rooms for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., not to exceed \$1,200; for the care, maintenance, and treatment of the insane of the Navy and Marine Corps on the Pacific coast, including supernumeraries held for transfer to the Government Hospital for the Insane; for dental outfits and dental material, and all other necessary contingent expenses; in all, \$1,500,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I think at this time it might be interesting to say to the House that the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy has practically fully equipped for medical purposes some 22 of the Army transports. That constitutes one of the important works of this bureau. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that up to the present time neither the Navy nor the Army has a single hospital ship.

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy has two.

Mr. BRITTEN. The Navy has purchased two steamers that are now being equipped as hospital ships.

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy had two before that.

Mr. BRITTEN. The Navy had the *Solace*, which was not a hospital ship but a makeshift. I am talking about a real hospital ship, such as the service has been demanding for 17 years, and finally by act of Congress more than a year ago we appropriated two and a half million dollars for a hospital ship, which is now being constructed at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. After a year from the date of authorization I find that it is 10 per cent completed. At that rate of progress it will take us 10 years to finish it. I agree that the construction has been set aside for work of greater importance.

I call attention to the fact that Congress authorized two and a half million dollars to build a real hospital ship, with a capacity for taking care of some 800 men; that is, 800 wounded, disabled, or sick soldiers. In the absence of that ship we have purchased two liners, at \$2,240,000 each—practically what the other ship would have cost had it been completed—and these ships have a combined capacity of but 700 men, at a total cost of about \$5,000,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that about the only real use for a hospital ship in the Navy, or even in the Army, is to transport the sick and wounded to a place where we have permanent marine or military hospitals?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is true.

Mr. McKENZIE. And is it not also a fact that the Surgeon General of the United States Army has testified that these great ocean liners, with but very little changes made in them, make first-class hospital ships for transporting our wounded?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; that is not the fact, because they can never afford proper facilities for amputating a leg or an arm. You might as well say—

Mr. McKENZIE. They have to have surgeons to do that.

Mr. BRITTEN. That you can remodel an old barn into a first-class hospital, and for that reason you will not provide a hospital until somebody gets sick or has his leg shot off—

Mr. McKENZIE. But is it not a fact that some of these great liners are actual floating palaces, far superior in equipment to any hospital?

Mr. BRITTEN. Superior in luxury, but the gentleman will agree that a perfectly plain sanitary operating room is more necessary.

Mr. McKENZIE. That can be easily put in.

Mr. PADGETT. Very easily put in.

Mr. BRITTEN. Not easily, adequately, or properly. What I am complaining about is this—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Speaking of transports, is it not the gentleman's understanding that we need these large liners for transport service instead of hospital ships?

Mr. BRITTEN. There is no question about it. The transport will be sunk at sight, whether there are sick men on it or not, and the hospital ship is protected by treaty.

Mr. PADGETT. That has not been our experience in this war.

Mr. BRITTEN. There is a military difference between the two characters of ships. Transports will be sunk at sight, while hospital ships should be free from attack.

A MEMBER. They do not seem to think so.

Mr. BRITTEN. We have an agreement to that effect, and until the central powers do not live up to it I will assume our hospital ships will not be sunk.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Hun ever live up to any agreement?

Mr. BRITTEN. All right; then let us agree that he will not live up to any agreement, but let us build a hospital ship as quickly as possible. If we do not need them, why are paying this \$5,000,000?

Mr. BUTLER. The Huns would sink it.

Mr. BRITTEN. We should have had one long ago, but certain members of the committee and certain Members of the House who have been continually calling for an increase of the Naval Establishment have been voted down in their desires; and the present administration, until a year ago, although it had been in power four years or more and the great European war had been going on for three years, made no attempt whatever to provide proper hospital ships. That is what I am complaining of.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on page 52, line 7, reference is made to a naval dispensary, Washington, D. C. On the same page, line 15, reference is made to a naval dispensary, Washington. Is that the State of Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Where is it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Line 15. Now in line 7 it refers to the naval dispensary, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PADGETT. The other is the State of Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is the inquiry.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And in line 18 it refers to the State of Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Naval medical school and naval dispensary, Washington. Yes, sir. They have one there and there is one out at Bremerton. They have a little dispensary at the navy yard and at Bremerton, that is part of the State of Washington; it is an island out there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I wanted to know where they were. The bill directly refers to Washington, in the District of Columbia, and there is no Washington in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PADGETT. They designate this, Washington, D. C., like they say, Washington Gun Factory, District of Columbia.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], has stated that we have purchased two ships for which we have paid four and a half million dollars and that these ships are constructed so as to provide hospital ships and fitted—

Mr. PADGETT. And fitted up for that.

Mr. SABATH. And fitted for that purpose because we could not build any ships and get them ready in the short space of time, but by acquiring these two ships they give us two hospital ships immediately without waiting for 10 years, as the gentleman tried to convey it would take to build new ones.

Mr. PADGETT. It would not have taken that long a time, but the Shipping Board requested that the building of hospital ships be postponed for more essential work and we purchased the two to meet the immediate necessities and fitted them out.

Mr. SABATH. And they are being fitted up for that purpose and have been recommended by experts that they can be used to good advantage as hospital ships?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, as I would like to reply to my colleague from Chicago [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. PADGETT. Let us make progress.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; after I use one minute. I think I ought to reply to my colleague from Chicago who says that I am complaining about the time it takes to construct ships. I wonder if my good friend realizes—and he is a very good friend of mine and a very good Democrat—I wonder if he realizes that this administration now in power has only authorized and commissioned one first-line fighting ship for the Navy as long as it has been in power. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. SABATH. I realize one thing, that the Navy and this administration are doing everything under the sun to win the war—

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; but they had many days of rain when there was no sun—

Mr. SABATH. And without the assistance of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. Of all the ships authorized since the present administration came into office more than five years ago, only one first-line fighting ship has been put into active commission. Does the gentleman know that, and does he think that is making progress when the world is surrounded by fire and a great war is going on?

Mr. SABATH. This is the first complaint I have heard from anyone about the Navy Department that it is not making progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FESS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to make a motion?

Mr. FESS. Yes. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery connected with the Navy Department is acting in unison with that connected with the Army?

Mr. PADGETT. They are working together, and working harmoniously together. They have their conferences. They are, of course, under different organizations and under different authorities, but they are coordinating all of their work. They are consulting with each other, and they are working out their plans in conjunction, and the Army is turning over to the Navy the transportation of its wounded from the battlefields to this country.

Mr. FESS. This museum down on the Mall, the Physicians' and Surgeons' Museum, which is rather an Army institution, is said to have one of the finest libraries, one of the finest collections, that can be found anywhere in the world. Is that a part of the Navy as well as of the Army?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know, sir. I do not know as to that. I saw a little controversy about that in a paper the other day. I have never looked into it. There has never been any complaint from the officers as to whether they have a joint library or not. I do not know about that.

Mr. FESS. It was a matter of information that I was trying to get as to what was the resource of the Navy in this particular line.

Mr. PADGETT. They are working harmoniously and coordinating their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of remains: To enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transferred to their homes the remains of officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, of members of the Nurse Corps, of civilian officers and crews of naval auxiliaries, and of officers and enlisted men of the Naval Militia and National Naval Volunteers and the Naval Reserve Force when on active service with the Navy, who die or are killed in action ashore or afloat, and also to enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transported to their homes the remains of civilian employees who die outside of the continental limits of the United States, \$350,000: *Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be available for payment for transportation of the remains of officers and men who have died while on duty at any time since April 21, 1898, and shall be available until June 30, 1920.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MADDEN. I simply wanted to ask the chairman of the committee whether the men who are killed die or whether there is a separate case against the man who dies and the man who is killed?

Mr. PADGETT. How is that?

Mr. MADDEN. I see the language in this paragraph relates to the man who dies and the man who is killed, and I was wondering whether the man who is killed dies or whether the man who dies is killed, and whether there was a different case in each instance.

Mr. PADGETT. They both die, I will say to the gentleman, but in two different aspects. If you said "died" and said he was not killed, some fellow would raise a verbal technicality on it.

Mr. MADDEN. When a man is killed he is dead, and it does not make any difference whether he dies from a bullet wound or from natural causes. The same condition ought to apply.

Mr. PADGETT. The same conditions do apply, and that language has been used ever since I have been a member of the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. That does not seem to make it any more binding, if I may use the term, and it does not seem to make it any more necessary. It ought not to be in. Certainly that language ought not to be employed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Would it make any of them "deader"?

Mr. MADDEN. No; it makes no difference whether they die after being killed or die without being killed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Care of hospital patients: For the care, maintenance, and treatment of patients in naval and in other than naval hospitals, for the rental and purchase of land, at Key West, Fla., and at the naval training station, Great Lakes, \$4,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. We would get along better if the chairman did not offer to amend the bill so much.

Mr. PADGETT. We are offering committee amendments. In these times conditions change very fast, and the committee must keep up with its work. I do not want to bring in an incomplete bill here and have it filled up with amendments made elsewhere.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, is this a committee amendment or an amendment offered by the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a committee amendment. The Chair thinks it would be a proper way to have it read and then discuss it afterwards.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] keeps inquiring about these committee amendments. He does not know, apparently, that they were adopted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair does not know what has happened in the committee. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PADGETT offers the following committee amendment: Page 53, after line 24, insert as a separate paragraph the following:

"United States Naval Hospital, Fort Lyons, Colo.: For the purchase of about 420 acres of land for the enlargement and development of the naval hospital, Fort Lyons, Colo., \$19,600."

Mr. BUTLER. That is in regard to the tuberculosis hospital?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

Pay of the Navy: Pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders, \$33,234,498; officers on the retired list, \$3,374,391; commutation of quarters for officers on shore not occupying public quarters, including boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, machinists, pharmacists, pay clerks, and mates, naval constructors, and assistant naval constructors, \$2,821,248, and also members of Nurse Corps (female), \$44,200; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, or commutation of quarters not to exceed the amount which an officer would receive were he not serving with troops, and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$25,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$540,255; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge, \$1,400,000; interest on deposit by men, \$15,000; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineers' force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, 180,000 men, plus 24,000 apprentice seamen, plus 10,000 men for Aviation Service, plus 14,000 men in trade schools, and pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, and for the pay of enlisted men detailed for duty with the Naval Militia, \$121,630,172; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, \$540,000, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and 24,000 apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, \$8,019,600; pay of the Nurse Corps, \$670,800; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps, \$55,800; retainer pay and active-service pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force, \$55,001,982; in all, \$227,372,946; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay of the Navy" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as "Pay of the Navy," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 54, lines 22 and 23, I wish to offer an amendment to strike out the language that is duplicated in two places.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PADGETT offers the following amendment: Page 54, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "plus 24,000 apprentice seamen."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. The language appears on that appropriation, and then it is on page 55, on lines 4 and 5. There is no use in having it in both places.

Mr. BUTLER. That is right.

Mr. FESS. On page 55, line 2, following the figures "\$540,000," is the language "and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint." Has the gentleman an amendment of that?

Mr. PADGETT. That has always been the provision, and is an indefinite number that the President appoints for the Navy.

Mr. FESS. I do not understand the language "pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, \$540,000, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint." What is the meaning of that?

Mr. PADGETT. We have machinists who are enlisted men in the Navy, and there is no limitation upon the number.

Mr. FESS. There is no figure in the appropriation.

Mr. PADGETT. All of that is one fund, for all purposes embraced in it.

Mr. FESS. Including the \$500,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it is all one fund.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provisions, Navy: For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers of messes, in case of death or desertion, upon orders of the commanding officers, commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the line, Medical and Pay Corps, chaplains, chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief carpenters, chief machinists, chief pay clerks, and chief sailmakers) and midshipmen, and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited at the rate of 50 cents per ration to the naval hospital fund; subsistence of officers and men unavoidably detained or absent from vessels to which attached under orders (during which subsistence rations to be stopped on board ship and no credit for commutation therefor to be given); subsistence of men on detached duty; subsistence of officers and men of the Coast Guard and Lighthouse Services while cooperating with the Navy in so far as the regular appropriations for these services are insufficient therefor; subsistence of officers and men of the naval auxiliary service; subsistence of members of the Naval Reserve Force during period of active service; and for subsistence of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service at the expiration of such confinement: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for such general courts-martial prisoners in such amounts as seem to him proper, which may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, but which shall in no case exceed 30 cents per diem for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency rations as required; in all, \$75,520,216, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee please explain what is meant by "including rations for general courts-martial prisoners"?

Mr. PADGETT. Whenever a prisoner is court-martialed and he is put in prison, he is allowed so much per day for rations in the prison.

Mr. MADDEN. Is he allowed to buy his own rations there?

Mr. PADGETT. He could do it if he wanted to.

Mr. MADDEN. In the prison?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; or he could have it transferred to the prison, if he is in a naval prison; but if he is in another prison that ration is commuted. He may lose his pay and allowances under the court-martial sentence, and all of those fines and losses of pay and commutation of rations go to the naval pension fund.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does "commutation of rations" mean to give him the option of taking it in cash?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. The law fixes the price at 40 cents a day for his support.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: For fuel; the removal and transportation of ashes and garbage from ships of war; books, blanks, and stationery, including stationery for commanding and navigating officers of ships, chaplains on shore and afloat, and for the use of courts-martial on board ships; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters for ships; packing boxes and materials; interior fittings for general storehouses, pay offices, and accounting offices in navy yards; expenses of disbursing officers; coffee mills and repairs thereto; expenses of naval clothing factory and machinery for the same; laboratory equipment; purchase of articles of equipage at home and abroad under the cognizance of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith, and the manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; musical instruments and music; mess outfits; soap on board naval vessels; athletic outfits; tolls, ferriages, women's stores, safes, and other incidental expenses; labor in general storehouses, paymasters' offices, and accounting offices in navy yards and naval stations, including naval stations maintained in island possessions under the control of the United States, and expenses in handling stores purchased and manufactured under "General account of advances"; and reimbursement to appropriations of the Department of Agriculture of cost of inspection of meats and meat food products for the Navy Department: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, storeman, store laborer, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, shall not exceed \$4,000,000; in all, \$17,826,625.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 58, line 3, there is a misprint. I want to strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nineteen."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 58, line 3, strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nineteen."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. On page 56, in line 25, the word "transportation" is misspelled. It ought to be corrected.

Mr. PADGETT. It is correct in the print I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk says it is incorrect in the copy of the bill which he is reading.

Mr. PADGETT. Then I ask that that be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fuel and transportation: Coal and other fuel for steamers' and ships' use, including expenses of transportation, storage, and handling the same; maintenance and general operation of machinery of naval fuel depots and fuel plants; water for all purposes on board naval vessels; and ice for the cooling of water, including the expense of transportation and storage of both, \$48,400,000: *Provided*, That when, in the opinion of the President, the prices asked for the charter of vessels for the transportation of fuel are excessive, he is authorized to purchase vessels suitable for the purpose, and, if money is not otherwise available, to pay for them from the appropriation "Fuel and transportation."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is five minutes after 5 o'clock.

Mr. PADGETT. It is only 4 o'clock by sun time.

Mr. MADDEN. We are not running by the sun. We are running by the clock. It has been a strenuous day, and it is likely that if we undertake to finish this bill to-night it will take until 9 or 10 o'clock.

Mr. PADGETT. I think we can read it in an hour.

Mr. BRITTEN. I should like to say to my colleague from Illinois that there is nothing in this bill from now on excepting steam engineering, construction and repair, and other items that should require no time whatever except the reading.

Mr. MADDEN. Gentlemen who are members of the Naval Affairs Committee have been talking all the afternoon, wasting time, when we could have had the bill completed and passed. There is no quorum present—

Mr. WALSH. I notice that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is here.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and he has taken a part of the time this afternoon. I think we ought to have a quorum here.

Mr. PADGETT. I will agree that the committee may rise at half past five, if we may proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is, the agreement will be conditioned upon the progress we make?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Naval Academy, exclusive of public works, \$1,242,271.20.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a request for unanimous consent. It will be borne in mind that we increased the Marine Corps by 45,500 men. That necessitated the increase of appropriation here, and it is a matter of mathematical calculation as to how much the various increases must be. I have them here. I want to ask that the Clerk may read without interruption all of the provisions with reference to the Marine Corps, and that I may then offer the amendments to correct the amounts by the additions made necessary on account of this increase in the force.

Mr. BUTLER. Why does not the gentleman ask permission simply to insert them?

Mr. PADGETT. It will take only a few minutes, and I can then offer one right after the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all provisions in the bill relating to the Marine Corps may be read without interruption, and that after the reading of that portion of the bill is concluded, the committee may recur to different paragraphs and offer amendments. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total Marine Corps, exclusive of public works, \$95,673,512.64.

Mr. PADGETT. I have a number of amendments correcting these totals. I will send them all up and let the Clerk read them one by one.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Chair will direct the Clerk to report the amendments one

at a time, beginning with the first one offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 7, strike out "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "fifty-five." Strike out "\$8,575,437" and insert "\$9,801,624.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 5, strike out "\$26,766,879" and insert "\$38,877,795."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 17, strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$377,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 19, strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$427,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 69, line 19, strike out "\$34,453,370.64" and insert "\$50,135,474.14."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 70, line 9, strike out "\$10,285,000" and insert "\$15,053,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 70, line 11, strike out "\$32,184,800" and insert "\$32,470,480."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 70, line 16, strike out "\$1,041,000" and insert "\$1,523,715."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 71, line 11, strike out "\$16,470,700" and insert "\$25,277,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 71, line 17, strike out "\$1,729,881" and insert "\$2,531,850."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 72, line 2, strike out "\$1,524,929" and insert "\$4,258,204."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 72, line 5, strike out "\$201,600" and insert "\$294,930."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 72, line 17, strike out "\$557,152" and insert "\$815,467."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 9, strike out "\$7,227,080" and insert "\$10,577,780."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 11, strike out "\$61,220,142" and insert "\$92,803,682."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 18, strike out "\$95,673,512.64" and insert "\$142,939,156.14."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the President to secure the more economical and expeditious delivery of materials, equipment, and munitions and secure the more expeditious construction of ships authorized and for the purchase or construction of such additional torpedo-boat destroyers, submarine chasers, and such other naval small craft, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, as the President may direct, to be expended at the direction and in the discretion of the President, \$100,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question here. I did not know that we gave the President of the United States \$100,000,000 in each of these war bills. I thought we gave him only \$100,000,000 all told.

Mr. PADGETT. We gave him already \$100,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. And is it now proposed to give him another \$100,000,000? Do we give him \$100,000,000 in each bill that is passed?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no. We gave him \$100,000,000, and that was for construction and the building of boats and various things of that kind, which have come out of that fund, but which have not been published to the world, in respect to the numbers. This is to complete and carry on that work.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought we only gave him \$100,000,000 in all.

Mr. PADGETT. We did in that first bill, but we are giving him now another \$100,000,000 to finish that work.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman means that we gave him \$100,000,000 in the Navy bill?

Mr. PADGETT. A year ago; yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And \$100,000,000 in addition to that outside of the Navy bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember that.

Mr. MADDEN. Why, certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. This was for the Navy, the other may have been for outside purposes, for war purposes; but this is given for the construction of ships, without advertising to the world the number we were obtaining.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 77, line 8, after the figures "\$4,000,000," strike out lines 9 to 22, inclusive.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 19, yeas 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

All unexpended balances made for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year 1918 in the naval appropriation act and the several acts making deficiency appropriations are hereby continued and made available for the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion simply to call attention to the fact that when the last naval appropriation bill was passed in this House, in February, 1917, there was a great discussion over submarines and battleships, many Members expressing the opinion that we ought to build submarines only, and nothing else; that all other types of fighting ships were out of date and practically useless. I took the floor in opposition to these ideas and declared that we ought to build more aeroplanes and more destroyers. In the course of my remarks on that occasion, February 10, 1917 (Cong. Rec., 64th Cong., 2d sess., p. 3046), I said:

It seems to me that the proper balance of different classes of vessels in the Navy—battleships, destroyers, cruisers, and submarines—is something we must leave to the naval experts. I believe they are all valuable. If I were going to go on my own ideas I should be inclined to build more destroyers, believing the destroyer a much more valuable ship than any of the others in proportion to its cost. It is fast, and if we should get involved in the present unpleasantness on the other side of the ocean, or if we are going to try to protect our merchant vessels, the destroyer is the ship that we want to do it with. The submarine always runs from a destroyer. The destroyers hunt out and destroy the submarines.

That was two months before we entered the war, though we had already broken diplomatic relations with the Imperial German Government. How entirely right I was subsequent events have shown. The destroyers for which we made appropriations in that bill, which became the act of March 4, 1917, have only recently been completed. I believe that some of them were launched in April, and some are not yet completed. My recollection is that the appropriations of that act provided for the construction of 20 destroyers. Some three months or more later, when war had been declared, we provided for the construction of a hundred destroyers, and later still for a very much larger number. Most of those later authorized have not yet been started, or construction of them has but recently begun. Had we in that bill of the winter of 1917, when there was every reason to believe that we could not long avoid war, made appropriations for five or ten times as many destroyers we should be in a very much safer position to-day, and should have little further fear of submarines in transporting our troops and supplies.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, have we finished the reading?

The CHAIRMAN. But one paragraph remains. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

All appropriations contained in this act are hereby made immediately available, but no appropriation in this act shall be used for payment of deficiencies.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, before we rise, for permission to insert in the RECORD some very handsome remarks made upon our esteemed colleague in this House, Mr. GEORGE S. GRAHAM, of Philadelphia. They were delivered at a time when his picture or painting was being hung in the law association in the City Hall in Philadelphia on March 5, 1918. Can I do this in committee? It has been done heretofore, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the committee can grant to one individual leave to extend remarks but not general leave.

Mr. BUTLER. That is what I ask. Without consuming time I would like to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting this handsome tribute to a friend and to a very learned and distinguished man, a Member of this House.

Mr. WALSH. What was the occasion of this well-deserved tribute?

Mr. BUTLER. His portrait was being presented to the law library in the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. GORDON. Who made the remarks?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Hampton L. Carson, ex-Attorney General of Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. FESS, Mr. WALDOW, Mr. MUDD, Mr. MCARTHUR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, and Mr. OLIVER of Alabama were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 10, line 23, strike out line 23 and insert the following: "grades, rank, and seniority: And provided further, That the dental officers herein and heretofore authorized for service in the Naval Reserve Force and the Naval Dental Corps shall share alike and proportionately with medical officers the several grades of rank provided for the Naval Reserve Force and the Naval Medical Corps, respectively, and the officers of the Naval Dental Corps shall earn and acquire like promotions under like mental, moral, physical, and age requirements, and be finally apportioned to like grades of rank on the same percentage basis as provided by law for the promotion and the grade apportionment of officers of the Naval Medical Corps."

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it is subject to a point of order, but we can vote it down in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is entitled to recognition.

Mr. GOOD. I understand the temper of the House, and I am not going to take any time. The amendment I have offered will do only simple justice to the dentists in the service and place them in the same rank with the Medical Corps.

Mr. BUTLER. There is a bill pending in the committee to cover this subject.

Mr. PADGETT. There is not only a bill pending in the committee, but this relates only to the Dental Corps in the reserves and the Medical Corps in the reserves. Under the existing law all ranks and grades are limited to lieutenant commander, which is equivalent to a major in the Army. Under this amendment they would have the higher ranks as well.

Mr. GORDON. In the Dental Corps?

Mr. PADGETT. In the Medical Corps and Dental Reserve Corps.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman will be fair about that. I did not propose to take any time, but the amendment I offer does not enlarge in the least the men in the Medical Corps, nor does it place any rank in the Dental Corps above the rank in the Medical Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. I know; but in the regular Medical Corps they have admirals and all the others, and this proposes to put the same rank into the Reserves as in the Medical Corps.

Mr. GOOD. The same as is done in the Army?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. GORDON. They have not done it in the Army yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 23, page 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

grade, rank, and seniority.

Mr. PADGETT. That is all right. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BUTLER. What is the effect of it?

Mr. PADGETT. They take their seniority with them in the transfer anyway. It does not affect anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: On page 10, in line 23, strike out the words "rank and grade" and insert "grade, rank, and seniority."

Mr. BUTLER. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. They would get that anyway.

Mr. BUTLER. I think they would, but I want to know what we are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraw the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. The amendment is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. PADGETT. It is amending the language in the bill.

Mr. GOOD. This just adds "seniority."

Mr. BUTLER. They would have that anyway.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly they would; but it is easier to pass it and go on than it is to have a dispute about it.

Mr. BUTLER. I am always a little suspicious of anything as easy as this.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, what became of the reservation of the point of order to the paragraph which I made when the gentleman offered his first amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to withdraw the point of order. Of course if a point of order is reserved, it is not in order to offer an amendment.

Mr. WALSH. The first amendment of the gentleman from Iowa was voted down, but I understood the entire paragraph was up for consideration.

Mr. MADDEN. I gave notice a little while ago that I would ask for a quorum at 5.30. I have been waiting to see whether we could complete the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. We can go ahead now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] make any point of order?

Mr. WALSH. In view of the emphatic statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] I do not dare to insist upon it. I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to make one statement to the House. It will take only a minute, and the House will be interested to know it.

Mr. Chairman, we have increased the Navy in this bill by 78,000 men and the Marine Corps by 45,500 men. We have provided for these other enlarged activities, and at the same time the bill as it is now carries \$265,481,251 less than the appropriations for the Navy for the current year.

I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. KITCHIN having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10854, the naval appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to serve notice on the House that the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the assistance of this House, passed this bill at the rate of \$140,000,000 per hour, and we are going to expect future committees to do the same thing.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KITCHIN) signed the same:

H. R. 10783. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to increase the facilities for the proof and test of ordnance material, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KING for 15 days, on account of pressing business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 22, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Director of the Federal Board for Vocational Education submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for rental of offices in the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1059); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting deficiency estimates of appropriations required by the Bureau of Education for medical relief and education of natives of Alaska for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1000); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Public Printer submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1061); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Lighthouse Service for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1062); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation for completion of the Treasury Building Annex, in Washington, D. C. (H. Doc. No. 1063); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11518) to amend the naturalization laws and to repeal certain sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States and other laws relating to naturalization, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 502), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9762) granting an increase of pension to Leon P. Chesley, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EMERSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 11578) providing for transportation of our soldiers and sailors who are on furlough for a visit home with at least half-fare rates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 11579) to authorize the appointment of a board of engineers to make a preliminary location, survey, and plans for a canal connecting the waters of Lake Erie and the Ohio River on the line of the Miami and Erie

Canal, from Toledo to Cincinnati, Ohio, and from a point near Defiance, Ohio, to a point in the southerly end of Lake Michigan, and to estimate the cost thereof; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 11580) to provide a new mine-rescue car for the mine-rescue station at Rock Springs, Wyo.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11581) providing for a mining station at Sheridan, Wyo., for investigation and demonstration in the utilization of lignite coal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11582) to suspend until the close of the present war the operation of the sections of the war-revenue act, approved October 3, 1917, relating to and providing for a zone system for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: Resolution (H. Res. 316) requesting the State Department to furnish to the House of Representatives full information regarding aliens liable to military service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 11583) granting an increase of pension to John C. Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 11584) for the relief of Jerome May; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 11585) granting a pension to Arthur A. Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 11586) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 11587) granting an increase of pension to Belle R. Reid; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONDON: A bill (H. R. 11588) for the relief of Marcus Broderick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 11589) granting an increase of pension to James B. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11590) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McCafferty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 11591) granting an increase of pension to James A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALDOW: A bill (H. R. 11592) granting an increase of pension to William H. Purdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11593) granting a pension to Peter L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 11594) granting a pension to Jasper Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 11595) granting an increase of pension to John G. Aarons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11596) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11597) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Pemberton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the South Dakota Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging war emergency prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of John O'Leary and 32 other citizens of Hudson, Wis., urging the immediate passage of the Overman bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the national research council, Council of National Defense, urging the passage of the law to encourage the production of vitally important mineral products; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of Charles A. Carlo, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting support of S. 31 and H. R. 6107; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York, protesting against the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; also, the petition of Smith & Hemenway Co., urging the passage of the Pomerene bill, providing for partial payment of income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, expressing 100 per cent patriotism and energetic support of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Resolution in opposition to the zone system as applied to second-class mail matter, by the executive committee of the Authors' League of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Resolutions of the Slovenian Republican Alliance, pledging heartiest support of the Government in the war and absolute loyalty to their adopted country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 22, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in Thy hands is the destiny of nations. Thou art moving forward in the accomplishment of Thy great purpose in the earth. Thou dost call us to the sphere of our personal responsibility that we may act according to the will of God and accomplish Thy divine purpose in us and through us. We pray Thee to fit us to-day for the divine obligations of the high and holy calling to which Thou hast called us as a Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. Smoot and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 218).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a dispatch from the American Ambassador at Paris stating that the Fourth General Assembly of the International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce has been postponed from the first days of May until the 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th days of July next, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

CENTRAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT WAR BUYING.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, transmitting a resolution unanimously adopted at the sixth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, held in Chicago, Ill., on April 10, 11, and 12, 1918, upon the subject of "Central control of Government war buying," which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INSTALLMENT PAYMENT OF TAXES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, transmitting a resolution unanimously adopted at the sixth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, held in Chicago, Ill., on April 10, 11, and 12, 1918, upon the subject of "Installment payment of taxes," which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4292) to conserve the gold supply of the United States; to permit the settlement in silver of trade balances adverse to the United States; to provide silver for subsidiary coinage and for commercial use; to assist foreign governments at war with the enemies of the United States; and for the above purposes to stabilize the price and encourage the production of silver.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10854) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 10783) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to increase the facilities for the proof and test of ordnance material, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

NONUSE OF WHEAT FLOUR IN TEXAS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a short letter from the Federal food administrator for the State of Texas, which I ask to have read. It announces the voluntary

determination of the people of Texas to abstain from the use of wheat flour for 45 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Houston, Tex., April 15, 1918.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. SHEPPARD: I feel sure you will be proud of your State in connection with its voluntary offer to abstain from the use of wheat flour for a period of 45 days, effective to-day, until June 1, and longer if necessary. I telegraphed this information to Mr. Hoover Saturday afternoon, and requested him to cable same to Gen. Pershing, whom I had the honor of knowing when he was stationed in Texas. I thought this good news would be encouraging and give renewed vigor to our boys in the trenches in France.

This was not a hysterical movement, but one which the people of Texas were anxious to undertake. I did not make the request. The offers kept coming in unsolicited. Now, I feel that the Lone Star State has done a great thing and is setting a wonderful example to the balance of our Nation. Surely this ought to make Mr. Hoover's work in reference to flour conservation considerably easier.

With best wishes, I am,
Yours, sincerely,

E. A. PEDAN,
Federal Food Administrator for Texas.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I present several memorials protesting against universal military service. I simply wish to state, in connection with their presentation, that I am receiving a great many letters favoring universal military service, but as these are simply personal letters I am not filing them with the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a petition of Tacoma Lodge, No. 102, of South Tacoma, Wash., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of all Federal judges with short terms of office, and placing the power in the people to recall Federal judges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, of Boston, Mass., praying for an increase in pensions of veterans of the Civil War, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Hudson, Mass., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented resolutions adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the fixing of prices on cereals other than wheat, such prices to be based upon the present price of wheat, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented resolutions adopted by the Arizona Division of the National Association for Universal Military Training, of Tucson, Ariz., favoring universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FERNALD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bangor, Augusta, Belfast, and Greenville, all in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to impose punishment on persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities, or who in any way interfere with the successful prosecution of the war, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4409) to amend section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 4410) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia," approved September 25, 1914; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 4411) granting an increase of pension to John Clark; and